

AGRICULTURAL LANDS WITHIN FOREST RESERVES.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CARTER. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. I wish to lodge a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill (H. R. 17576) to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves was passed yesterday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon enters a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill indicated by him was passed, and asks that the House of Representatives be requested to return the bill, it having been transmitted to the House.

Mr. FULTON. I do not wish to ask to have the motion acted on at this time.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. No. The motion to reconsider is entered, and the request will be made of the House of Representatives to return the bill.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. CARTER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After forty minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 7, 1906, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 4, 1906.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Walter H. Sales, of Bozeman, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Bozeman, Mont., vice James M. Kelly, resigned.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 4, 1906.

SURVEYOR-GENERAL OF FLORIDA.

Charles H. Parlin, of Apalachicola, Fla., to be surveyor-general of Florida.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Walter H. Sales, of Bozeman, Mont., to be receiver of public moneys at Bozeman, Mont.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY.

Paul J. Bean, a citizen of Texas, to be an assistant civil engineer in the Navy from the 27th day of April, 1906.

SURVEYOR OF CUSTOMS.

Robert A. Ravenscroft, of Maryland, to be surveyor of customs in the district of Baltimore, in the State of Maryland.

POSTMASTERS.

ARKANSAS.

William C. Roberts to be postmaster at Rogers, in the county of Benton and State of Arkansas.

CALIFORNIA.

T. W. Henry to be postmaster at Paso Robles, in the county of San Luis Obispo and State of California.

D. F. Hunt to be postmaster at Santa Barbara, in the county of Santa Barbara and State of California.

CONNECTICUT.

Isaac L. Trowbridge to be postmaster at Naugatuck, in the county of New Haven and State of Connecticut.

ILLINOIS.

John A. Leu to be postmaster at Highland, in the county of Madison and State of Illinois.

W. W. Lewis to be postmaster at Greenville, in the county of Bond and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Charles Carter to be postmaster at Converse, in the county of Miami and State of Indiana.

William C. Nichols to be postmaster at Lowell, in the county of Lake and State of Indiana.

IOWA.

Gordon R. Badgerow to be postmaster at Sioux City, in the county of Woodbury and State of Iowa.

KANSAS.

John McPherson to be postmaster at Blue Rapids, in the county of Marshall and State of Kansas.

P. Moore to be postmaster at Weir, in the county of Cherokee and State of Kansas.

Thomas A. Sawhill to be postmaster at Concordia, in the county of Cloud and State of Kansas.

KENTUCKY.

William A. Waters to be postmaster at Springfield, in the county of Washington and State of Kentucky.

MASSACHUSETTS.

Frederick B. Horne, to be postmaster at Framingham, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Reuben K. Sawyer to be postmaster at Wellesley, in the county of Norfolk and State of Massachusetts.

MISSOURI.

Henry A. Ayre to be postmaster at Oronogo, in the county of Jasper and State of Missouri.

NEBRASKA.

John Cusack to be postmaster at North Bend, in the county of Dodge and State of Nebraska.

Frank W. Wake to be postmaster at Genoa, in the county of Nance and State of Nebraska.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Fred H. Ackerman to be postmaster at Bristol, in the county of Grafton and State of New Hampshire.

OHIO.

Joseph A. Shriver to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Adams and State of Ohio.

TEXAS.

John A. Gray to be postmaster at Laredo, in the county of Webb and State of Texas.

TRADE-MARK TREATY WITH ROUMANIA.

The injunction of secrecy was removed May 4, 1906, from a convention between the United States and Roumania for the reciprocal protection of trade-marks, signed at Bucharest on March 31, 1906.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, May 4, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill; and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be controlled by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER] and myself, the same as yesterday, without attempting to limit the time of general debate.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is under the impression that that order was made on yesterday.

Mr. FOSS. I think that order applied only to yesterday, and I would like to have it apply generally.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that all time consumed in general debate on the naval appropriation bill shall be divided equally between the majority and the minority, the time to be controlled, half and half, by himself and by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MEYER]. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, that exact request was made and consented to yesterday.

The SPEAKER. The Chair was under that impression, but the gentleman from Illinois thinks it covered only yesterday.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The request was not made for yesterday; it was made for general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is informed that the Journal so shows, and the gentleman from Illinois is mistaken.

MARY DAGENFIELD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16215) granting an increase of pension to Mary Dagenfield, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

WILLIAM F. M. RICE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15687) granting an increase of pension to William F. M. Rice, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LEWIS DE LAITRE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15907) granting an increase of pension to Lewis De Laitre, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Jersey that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

JEREMIAH LUNSFORD.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 11635) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lunsford, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SULLOWAY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

SARAH M. D. HINMAN.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 10251) granting an increase of pension to Sarah D. M. Hinman with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. SULLOWAY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LAURA B. IHRIE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8226) granting an increase of pension to Laura B. Ihrie, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Senate amendment be concurred in.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States, was communicated to the House of Representatives, by Mr. BARNES, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

H. R. 14397. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907; and

H. R. 17576. An act to provide for the entry of agricultural lands within forest reserves.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 15435. An act to empower the Secretary of War to convey to the city of Minneapolis certain lands to exchange for other lands to be used for flowage purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 5372. An act to prevent dangers to navigation from rafts of logs or timbers on coast waters of the United States; and

S. R. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to award the Congressional medal of honor to Roe Reisinger.

SENATE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and joint resolution of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 5372. An act to prevent dangers to navigation from rafts of logs or timbers on coast waters of the United States—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 13. Joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to award the Congressional medal of honor to Roe Reisinger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also bill of the following title, with Senate amendments:

H. R. 14397. An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1907—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

EDWARD GILLESPIE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 15397) granting an increase of pension to Edward Gillespie, with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New Hampshire that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

JOHNSON COUNTY, WYO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 16521) directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and convey a certain parcel of land to Johnson County, Wyo., with a Senate amendment thereto.

The Senate amendment was read.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Wyoming that the House concur in the Senate amendment.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President; which was read, ordered to be printed, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

[At the conclusion of the reading of the message there was loud general applause.]

[For message, see Senate proceedings of this date.]

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 18750—the naval appropriation bill—Mr. CRUMPACKER in the chair.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I would ask how the time has been consumed up to the present time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has used three hours and one minute and the gentleman from Louisiana has used one hour and eight minutes.

Mr. FOSS. I suggest the gentleman from Louisiana use some of his time now.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. FLOOD].

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, while the remarks which I will submit will not be upon the pending bill, they will be upon a subject most appropriate while the naval bill is under consideration. I desire to ask the attention of the House to a bill which has been reported from the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions, to authorize the United States Government to participate in the Jamestown Tercentennial Exposition, to be held on the shores of the Hampton Roads, in Norfolk County, Va., in the year 1907, and to appropriate money in aid thereof.

This bill carries an appropriation aggregating \$1,480,000, only \$250,000 of which is a direct appropriation to the exposition company, the residue of the appropriation being for the Government exhibit, transportation of troops, entertainments, and other features in which the Government is directly interested.

While it is an assured fact that the Jamestown Exposition will be held, its magnitude and the impression produced by it upon foreign nations will depend largely upon this appropriation.

This exposition is to commemorate the first permanent English settlement upon this hemisphere. Such an event should be observed in a manner befitting the dignity of our great nation, and especially so since this nation has invited the participation of the naval powers of the world.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguishing feature of this exposition, above any the world has ever seen, will be the gathering of war ships of every naval power on the globe. In the ample waters of Hampton Roads will be such a naval demonstration as has occurred nowhere in all the realms of history, and such as has not been possible anywhere in the expositions of the past. There will likewise be a magnificent military encampment.

An industrial display will also be a feature of the exposition; but in the main it will be commemorative and historical. It is a common remark that the most momentous events in history have taken their rise from small beginnings. The Reformation that spread the illumination of Protestant Christianity over the Old World and over the New had its origin in a sudden pang of conscience and questioning of the soul by a monk as, upon his knees for penance, he climbed the steps of St. Peter's. So this land of political and religious freedom had, so to speak, a like elemental initiative. This mighty Republic, now spanning the continent with a continuous stretch of sovereign States, each in itself an empire, had its beginning in a colony of 105 half famished, unfriended souls, who, on the 13th of May, 1607, landed at Jamestown.

It would be hard to describe adequately the effect upon the history of mankind of the planting of that colony. It was not only the commencement of the English system of colonization, a system which has made Great Britain one of the foremost powers of the globe, but it resulted in the almost exclusive possession of the American Continent by the Anglo-Saxon race. Like unto this beginning of the greatest republic of modern times was the origin of the greatest republic of antiquity. Away back in the faint twilight of history a band of fugitives from the flames of Troy settled upon the shores of Latium and laid the foundation of mighty Rome, a republic that grew to be the mistress of the world. But majestic as was that republic, it is not to be compared in any of the essentials of greatness, in the attributes of mental and moral grandeur, in the attainments of the highest fruition of civilization, nor in that military prowess which was its supreme boast—in none of these constituents of greatness is it to be compared with the unique and wonderful Republic which originated in that settlement of English colonists within the domain of the Indian kind Powhatan and upon the banks of the river which at that time bore his name.

In this practical utilitarian age, when the spirit of commercial greed so largely predominates and the great object of life seems to many to be to put money in the purse, we occasionally meet with men who are disposed to ridicule and deride what they call "mere sentiment." Such men forget, however, that it is sentiment that rules the world. Many years ago Andrew Fletcher, a Scotchman, wrote to the Marquis of Montrose a letter in which he said:

I know a very wise man who believes that if a man were permitted to write all the songs of the people, he did not care who wrote their laws.

From time immemorial mankind has evinced an inalienable disposition to recall the traditions of the past, to preserve their ancient landmarks, and to cherish their sacred memories, and there can be surely no higher incentive to honor, to virtue, and to patriotism.

Mr. Chairman, a more appropriate, nay, an equally appropriate spot could not be found upon this continent than Jamestown in which to recall the august and romantic history of the past by a memorial exhibit, for it will be upon soil and amid scenes abounding in interesting and sacred memories alike of the colonial period and of the Revolutionary era.

As for a naval and marine display, there can not be found in all the harbors of America, or in the harbors of any continent on either hemisphere, so appropriate an expanse of water as the Chesapeake Bay and the ample and noble harbor of Hampton Roads, which forms the southern extremity of that bay. This harbor is more capacious than that which is entered by the Golden Gate, now consecrated to undying memory by the wreck of the splendid city to which it gave access and by the peerless and unshaken fortitude of its people. The harbor of Hampton Roads is more capacious than any other upon the Pacific coast, nor is it equalled in capacity or safety, in extent and depth, by any other upon the Atlantic coast, not excepting even the harbor of New York. It is sheltered from the ocean's storms by the two Virginia capes, the open gateway to the Atlantic, and the gateway through which civilization and freedom entered this continent. Upon its banks the two Virginia ports of Norfolk and Newport

News sit like imperial queens of commerce, looking with proud gaze upon an expanse of water limited only by the sweep of the human eye, and upon whose bosom the naval armaments of all nations and the combined merchant marine of the entire world may ride at anchor with affluent berth.

Mr. Chairman, in historical interest, memorials of the colonial period and of the Revolutionary era, there is no environment upon this continent comparable to that in which the Jamestown Exposition is to be held.

At Jamestown Capt. John Smith was tried and acquitted by a jury, the first jury trial in America. When Lord De La Warr, the first governor of Virginia, came thither in 1610 he found at Jamestown a church, the first permanent religious edifice erected by Englishmen upon this continent. The ruined tower of this church is still standing. When Governor Yeardley began his administration he brought from the London council to the founders of the Jamestown colony an order to convene a general assembly, the name by which the Virginia legislature is called to this day. The members of this general assembly were to consist of burgesses, or borough representatives, of the plantations, towns, and hundreds. In pursuance of this order, on July 30, 1619, more than a year before the landing on Plymouth Rock, the first legislative body that ever sat in America assembled at Jamestown. The event was propitious; the old world had passed away and the new was born.

In 1710 Alexander Spotswood came as governor of the colony, bringing with him the great writ of habeas corpus, and thus Magna Charta was established in America.

When the Jamestown settlement was destroyed by fire during Bacon's rebellion, in 1676, the colony removed to a locality seven miles distant and there established the town of Williamsburg, the first colonial capital. The foundations of the capitol buildings are still to be seen where the house of burgesses met, and where Washington was received on his return from Braddock's disastrous campaign and was voted a sword as a tribute to his military skill and valor. It was the building, too, in which, in 1765, Patrick Henry wrote, upon a blank leaf torn from an old law book, his resolutions against the stamp act, and amid cries of "Treason!" advocated them with an eloquence which had never before in the new world fallen from mortal tongue.

This was the alarm bell, the signal gun, of the Revolution. Standing at the open door, and spellbound by the burning words of the orator, and the stupendous scene enacting before his eyes, was a youth of 22, a law student, who, eleven years afterward, was to write the Declaration of Independence, and later become the third President of the United States.

There at Williamsburg may also be seen the site of the old Raleigh Tavern, in which the burgesses convened when driven from the capital by Lord Dunmore for treasonable denunciation of the oppressive measures of the English King and Parliament. In the "Apollo room" of that historical tavern the committee of safety was organized and held those meetings which started the ball of the Revolution. And there, too, still stands the powder horn, or magazine, from which Lord Dunmore carried off the gunpowder which Patrick Henry, at the head of the Hanover Militia, compelled him to account for.

There, too, sat the memorable convention of 1776 that adopted the Virginia bill, or declaration of rights, written by George Mason, the most luminous epitome of political and personal rights and principles ever formulated by the pen of man, and upon which have been modeled all of the similar bills successively adopted by the States of the Union.

The same convention adopted the Virginia constitution of 1776, also from the pen of George Mason. This was the first written constitution of government ever adopted by a free people. The preamble of this constitution was written by Thomas Jefferson and was sent from Philadelphia, where he was in attendance upon the Continental Congress. It contained a declaration of the severance of Virginia from allegiance to the British Crown, and along with the constitution to which it was appended was adopted on the 29th day of June, 1776, five days before the adoption, on July 4, of the Declaration of Independence by the Continental Congress.

Not far distant from the old capital of Virginia is Yorktown, where now stands a lofty monument erected by the American Congress to commemorate the surrender of Cornwallis and the triumph of the Revolutionary armies on the 19th day of October, 1781. The old Moore house, in which Cornwallis signed the articles of capitulation, is still standing, as is the Nelson house, the home of Thomas Nelson, the war governor of Virginia during the later Revolutionary period, he who sacrificed his large fortune in the cause of independence, and who, at the siege of Yorktown, offered a reward of 5 guineas to any can-

noneer who would throw a ball into his own dwelling house, which was supposed to be occupied by the British general and his staff.

I have alluded, Mr. Chairman, to a circumstance which associates by historical suggestion the beginning of our Republic with the foundation of the mightiest republic of antiquity. Let me refer for a moment to a coincidence in the early history of another ancient republic suggested by the momentous event in our history to which I have just alluded. Yorktown, the scene of the triumph of our armies over our British foes, is 12 miles from Williamsburg, the colonial capital of Virginia. About the same distance from Athens, the capital of Greece, is the field of Marathon, where 10,000 Athenians defeated the mighty hosts of Persia and delivered their country from the thralldom and dread of that haughty Empire, and opened the way to the freedom, the supremacy, and the splendor of Greece. The mound still stands in which were buried the dead of that memorable field. There nightly the ear of superstition may still hear the clangor of arms, the neighing of horses, and the echoes of their feet as they frantically rush across the plains. At Yorktown no audible sounds reach the ear, but the soul of patriotism is there stirred by memories of the mighty spirits and great achievement which secured our independence.

The celebration of these noble events, beginning with the first settlement of our race upon this continent, and coming down to the independence of our country, will take place on Virginia soil near the scenes of the historical events I have described. The people of the entire State of Virginia feel a deep interest in this event and naturally desire to see it a glorious success; and desire to see the bill as reported amended in a few particulars and passed.

They feel that Virginia's call for aid will be heeded by the Representatives of every State upon this floor, but especially by the Representatives of those States with whose founding she was so essentially identified. There are some, perchance, with whom her appeal should have greater weight than with others, but it is an appeal that should not be disregarded by the Representatives of any State in the entire Union.

Mr. Chairman, if there is one State Virginia should be able to appeal to with confidence that State is Massachusetts. Virginia and Massachusetts are linked together in a common destiny of sacred memories and of inextinguishable glory. When Virginia organized her committee of safety and correspondence, it was Massachusetts that, under the lead of Samuel Adams, responded to the signal and formed her similar committee, and through these committees the colonies kept in touch with each other throughout the exciting events that led up to the Revolution until what time the reverberation of the guns of Concord and Lexington summoned the Virginia troops to the assistance of their countrymen in the besieged city of Boston.

The late venerable Senator Hoar, in an address before the Virginia Bar Association a few years since, made a beautiful reference to the historical and patriotic reminiscences that bind these two Commonwealths together:

When—
Said he—

a Virginian penned the Declaration of Independence Massachusetts furnished the greatest advocate on the floor of Congress. When Virginia produced Washington Massachusetts called him to the head of the Army. When Virginia gave Marshall to jurisprudence it was John Adams, of Massachusetts, who summoned him to his exalted seat.

But, Mr. Chairman, Massachusetts is not the only State to which Virginia can appeal with confidence. We can surely depend upon Kentucky, cut as she was from Botetourt County, an ancient Virginia county extending in 1792 to the Mississippi River, from which in that year the beautiful State of Kentucky was taken and presented by Virginia as her fairest daughter to the Union.

And there are the elder daughters of Virginia—Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, and Michigan. The first four and half of the fifth were formed out of the northwestern territory which Virginia, with a lavish and patriotic prodigality, by the ordinance of 1787, gave to the Union to heal the discords that threatened to prevent the adoption of the measures by which a "more perfect union" was to be formed. And then there are those great Commonwealths that lie between the Mississippi and Oregon rivers, formed from that vast territory which the foresight and patriotism of Virginia's son, Thomas Jefferson, secured to our country. And Florida, which was acquired for the American Union by the wisdom of James Monroe, of Virginia, and finally the great Lone Star State, which was brought into the Union by the action of John Tyler, another Virginian.

Nor, Mr. Chairman, should the appeal of Virginia be disregarded by the Representatives upon this floor of any State in the Union. As was said by Hon. John Goode, in an address

delivered before the committee from which this bill was reported:

The American Union is in great part the creation of Virginia. * * * It was her son who penned that immortal document which declares that whenever government becomes destructive of the ends for which it is created it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it and institute a new government. * * * It was her son who was confessedly the father of the American Constitution. * * * It was her son who presided over the Supreme Court from 1801 to 1835, and blazed the way for his successors in the interpretation of the Constitution. It was her son who stood by the helm of the ship of state on its perilous voyage, and is now by universal acclaim of all mankind recognized as the greatest of good men and the best of great men, that illustrious son of whom the poet has beautifully sung:

All discord ceases at his name,
All ranks contend to swell his fame.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not a matter in which Virginia is solely interested, nor in which one particular State is solely interested. It is a commemoration of the planting of the first English colony upon this continent; the beginning of the settlement and occupation of this country by our ancestors, and the introduction of Anglo-Saxon civilization into a wilderness. It is intended to commemorate the birth of the American nation in order that the great events which have resulted therefrom may be accentuated to the present and future generations of American citizens.

Is it not fitting that we shall hand down the beginning of such great events to future generations, and can we look with unconcern upon the endeavor to commemorate this beginning?

If so, we shall be unmindful of the truth uttered by Edmund Burke, that—

Those who are indifferent to the past will never do anything worthy of the future.

If so, we shall have degenerated from the generous spirit of our illustrious countryman, James G. Blaine, who, in his "Thirty Years in Congress" urging for a sufficient allowance to be made Virginia by the General Government to compensate, at least, for that part of her public debt which might be presumptively presented by the territory taken from her in the creation of West Virginia, uses these words:

Nor should it be forgotten that the State of Virginia before the war might well be regarded as the creditor and not the debtor of the National Government. One of her earliest acts of patriotism as an independent State was the cession to the General Government of her superb domain on the north side of the Ohio River, from the sale of which more than \$100,000,000 have been paid into the Treasury.

He concludes his interesting chapter with this beautiful tribute to the old mother of States and statesmen:

In the formal and necessarily austere administration of public affairs there is little room for the interposition of sentiment. Yet sentiment has its place. We stimulate the ardor of patriotism by the mere display of a flag, which has no material force, but which is emblematic of all material force and typical of the glory of the nation. We stir the ambition of the living by rearing costly monuments to the heroic dead.

It may surely be pardoned if Americans should feel a deep personal interest in the good name and good fortune of a State so closely identified with the early renown of the Republic—a State with whose soil is mingled the dust of those to whom all States and all generations are debtors—the Father of his Country, the author of the Declaration of Independence, the chief projector of the National Constitution.

Mr. Chairman, as her humblest son, I am not afraid of being esteemed arrogant when I avow the belief that whilst this nation may becomingly commemorate the fame of that ancient Commonwealth it can not amplify her renown.

I am confident that those in this body who have ingenuously studied her annals will not look with disfavor upon this appropriation.

Our governmental organism pulsates with her life. Our enduring institutions are the lengthened shadows of her sons. She has vivified our history with a spirit which is immortal.

Nor strong tower, nor walls of beaten brass,
Nor airless dungeons, nor strong links of iron,
Can be retentive to the strength of spirit.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield forty minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida is recognized for forty minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, unwillingly I find myself in a position where I am forced to attempt to say something about the tariff. I have been chary of undertaking to make tariff speeches since I heard a story some years ago, Mr. Chairman. It is said that a certain man was arraigned in court upon an indictment charging him with murder. He had no counsel, and said that he desired none, but simply asked permission to make a statement to the court in extenuation of his offense, which was accorded him. He said to the court:

It is true, Judge, that I killed the man. I admit that I killed him; but I want to tell you why I did it and how I did it. I am a farmer, and on the day that the offense was committed I was sitting on my veranda, at my own home, quietly reading my county newspaper, late in the afternoon. I was at peace with all the world. I had naught against any living man, but this man finally came into my gate, came

up to where I was, and proceeded without the slightest provocation to curse and abuse me. I did not resent it. I allowed him to continue until he was tired, and finally becoming tired he left me, went back to the rear of the house where my wife was engaged in her household duties, proceeded to curse and abuse her, and still I did not resent it. When he had tired of that he went out into the yard where my children were at play, abused them in my presence, and I permitted that. When he left off that he went out and kicked and cuffed my dog; and I even took that. When he had finished with the dog he came back to where I was, and when he reached in his pocket and pulled a manuscript therefrom and proceeded to deliver to me a speech on the tariff I rose up in my might and I slew him.

[Applause and laughter.]

That has deterred me, Mr. Chairman, from ever attempting to say anything about the tariff, but I find myself now where it appears to be imperative that I say something upon that subject, and I want to say, Mr. Chairman, and I shall detain the committee but a few minutes, that the Democratic party, to which I belong, has never at any period in its long and eventful history been a free-trade party. That persons of prominence who were free traders have been members of the Democratic party; that men of great prominence who are to-day advocates of free trade are supporters of the Democratic party is undoubtedly true, but the injustice of attempting to bind a great political party to support of a particular doctrine merely because individual members of that party are its supporters is apparent. The only just rule by which the position of a political party on a given question can be and should be determined is by an investigation of its platform declarations upon that subject and by an investigation of its legislative enactments when in full control of the law-making power of the Government. This is the only just rule, this is the only fair test, and I contend that the Democratic party in no convention has ever declared for free trade or has ever declared for anything approaching free trade. I contend further, Mr. Chairman, when in control of this Government, and it was in control for a great many years, in control of all of its branches, the Democratic party has never written into the law of this land a single statute that smacks of free trade. So, I say, it is unjust to the Democratic party to charge it with being a free-trade party because some of its members are free traders, or very nearly so. It matters not, Mr. Chairman, what individual newspapers or statesmen, however prominent, claiming allegiance to the Democratic party, may have said about the tariff, that party has never in any platform declared for free trade or for a tariff schedule approaching free trade. The Democratic party, when in control of Congress, has never committed nor attempted to commit this Government to the policy of free trade. If free trade were a Democratic doctrine, why did not the representatives of the party write it into the laws of the land during its long lease of power? It is a presumption of law, I believe, that when it is shown that a man has it in his power to do a certain thing and does not do it, he does not want to do it. Therefore the conclusion here is irresistible that the Democratic party was not in favor of free trade, because it had the absolute power to declare for free trade, to enact free-trade legislation, yet during all its long years of power, in the control of the executive and legislative branches of the Government, both in their entirety, it has never declared for any such principle. So I am justified, Mr. Chairman, in contending that the Democratic party is not a free-trade party.

I want to call attention for just a moment to the declaration of the party on that subject in 1896. And this, Mr. Chairman, is but a specimen declaration in all of the platforms of the party. It is true here and there in Democratic national conventions words have been at times loosely used in setting forth a declaration of principles, but any fair-minded man who will examine the platform of any year in its entirety will find that it has steadfastly adhered to the doctrine that a tariff for the purposes of this Government was absolutely necessary, and they have never, as I said, broached free trade.

In 1896 they said this:

We hold that the tariff duties should be levied for purposes of revenue, such duties to be so adjusted as to operate equally throughout the country and not discriminate between class or section, and that taxation should be limited by the needs of the Government honestly and economically administered.

And in 1892, four years before, they said this—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Did the gentleman from Florida read all of the plank on the tariff in the platform of 1896?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No, sir.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Will he kindly do so?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will do it if the gentleman wants me to.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. It was the platform of 1896?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I was saving time. I will read the balance of it, as follows:

We denounce, as disturbing to business, the Republican threat to restore the McKinley law, which has been twice condemned by the people in national elections, and which, enacted under the false plea of protection to home industry, proved a prolific breeder of trusts and monopolies, enriched the few at the expense of the many, restricted trade, and deprived the producers of the great American staples of access to their natural markets. Until the money question is settled, we are opposed to any agitation for further changes in our tariff laws, except such as are necessary to keep the deficit in revenue caused by the adverse decision of the Supreme Court on the income tax.

But for this decision by the Supreme Court there would be no deficit in the revenue under the law passed by the Democratic Congress in strict pursuance of the uniform decisions of that court for nearly one hundred years, that court having sustained constitutional objections to its enactment which had been overruled by the ablest judges who have ever sat on that bench. We declare that it is the duty of Congress to use all the constitutional power which remains after that decision, or which may come by the reversal of the court as it may hereafter be constituted, so that the burdens of taxation may be equally and impartially laid, to the end that wealth may bear its due proportion of the expenses of the Government.

That, I think, is all of it.

I am very much obliged to the gentleman for calling my attention to it. I did not care to take up the time to read it, but, Mr. Chairman, it fully explains the Democratic principles on the tariff.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Will the gentleman now read the platform declaration in 1892?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am going to read that now.

We denounce Republican protection as a fraud—

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few.

[Renewed applause.]

We declare it to be a fundamental principle of the Democratic party that the Federal Government has no constitutional power to impose and collect tariff duties, except for the purposes of revenue only, and we demand that the collection of such taxes shall be limited to the necessities of the Government when honestly and economically administered.

[Renewed applause.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I would like to ask the gentleman now—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will read the balance of it; better let me read it all.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida declines to yield.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I will read it all, and then I will yield to the gentleman.

We denounce the McKinley tariff law enacted by the Fifty-first Congress as the culminating atrocity of class legislation; we indorse the efforts made by the Democrats of the present Congress to modify its most oppressive features in the direction of free raw materials and cheaper manufactured goods that enter into general consumption, and we promise its repeal as one of the beneficent results that will follow the action of the people in intrusting power to the Democratic party. Since the McKinley tariff went into operation there have been ten reductions of the wages of the laboring men to one increase.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

We deny that there has been any increase of prosperity to the country since that tariff went into operation, and we point to the dullness and distress, to the wage reductions and strikes in the iron trade as the best possible evidence that no such prosperity has resulted from the McKinley Act.

We call the attention of thoughtful Americans to the fact that after thirty years of restrictive taxes against the importation of foreign wealth in exchange for our agricultural surplus the homes and farms of the country have become burdened with a real estate mortgage debt of over two thousand five hundred million dollars, exclusive of all other forms of indebtedness; that in one of the chief agricultural States of the West there appears a real estate mortgage debt averaging \$165 per capita of the total population, and that similar conditions and tendencies are shown to exist in the other agricultural exporting States. We denounce a policy which fosters no industry so much as it does that of sheriff.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Now I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will ask the gentleman if it is not practically the same platform upon which the English Government raises revenue to carry on the affairs of that nation?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I think not; but I am not so thoroughly informed as to the English taxing system.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. In other words, is that not the form of political declaration that is known as "free trade" among nations?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all. I think not, sir. Now, Mr. Chairman, the position of the Democratic party upon this question—

Mr. NEEDHAM. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Is the gentleman in favor of the present tariff on citrus fruit?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am, absolutely.

Mr. NEEDHAM. Upon what theory does the Democratic party base that?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am right with the gentleman from California on that proposition.

Mr. Chairman, it will be seen that the position of the Democratic party, then, is this, as I understand it—and I do not want the Democratic party held responsible for what I say. I am not a leader of the Democratic party. My declarations do not make Democratic law. My opinions would not be accepted as Democratic authority; but as an humble Democrat, as an humble member of the party, I have the right to my opinions as to what the party stands for; and my opinion is that the Democratic party on this question stands for a tariff for revenue sufficient to support the Government when its affairs are administered economically, but not niggardly; not in favor of a tariff levied solely for the purpose of protection. I am not in favor of the levy of a duty which in its practical operation will be prohibitive. I am in favor of the levy of a duty which will produce the necessary revenue for the purposes of the Government; and whenever the taxing power goes further than is necessary to raise the money to pay the expenses of the Government, economically and honestly administered, it goes, in my judgment, beyond the constitutional power to tax. [Applause.] We should levy a duty with a view to raising revenue for the purposes of the Government economically administered and not solely for the purpose of protection. Whenever a duty is levied upon an article imported into this country for sale to the American people it must undoubtedly increase the cost of that article to the American purchaser, and to that extent it is a burden on such purchaser—

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Let me finish this sentence, please. And to the same extent is a benefit to the American citizen who has articles of the same kind for sale, grown or manufactured in this country. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The gentleman states that the effect of a protective tariff is to increase the price of the article.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The effect of any tariff.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. That the effect of any tariff is to increase the price of the article protected by the amount of the tariff.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Approximately.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will ask the gentleman if he can cite a single article manufactured in this country the price of which is higher to-day than it was the day the tariff was placed upon the article?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; nor higher anywhere else.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not know that I can at this moment, because I have not investigated that.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Florida that that challenge has been made, in answer to that assertion, time and time again, and I have never yet had cited a single manufactured article that is higher to-day than it was the day the tariff was placed upon it; and if the gentleman can cite any such article I should like to have him do it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if the gentleman from Florida will permit a further interruption—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would suggest that he might challenge the gentleman from Indiana to name a single article upon which there is an American import duty levied, and which is lower now than it was at the time the import duty was levied, the price of which is not also lower in Great Britain, Cape Colony, Australia, the Argentine, all over Europe, and everywhere else—especially where there is no protectionism. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. If the gentleman will permit me—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Florida yield to the colloquy between the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. With the kindness of the gentleman I will say that along about 1883 we placed a tariff of \$4 a hundred upon wire nails. At that time, if the year is correct, there were no wire nails manufactured in this country. According to the theory of the gentleman from Florida, the price of wire nails should have been increased by the amount of the tariff. The price was somewhat increased for some months, but a wire-nail factory was started in the United States, and soon the price fell from \$6 to \$5. More wire-nail factories started, and the price dropped to \$4. In the course of a year

or two it dropped to \$3, then to \$2.50, to \$2, and finally to \$1.85—

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the price has gone up since.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. The duty still remained at \$4 a hundred. Now, according to the theory of the gentleman from Florida, the price of wire nails should have been continued as long as that tariff existed at the original price plus \$4, when, as a matter of fact, the price fell as low as \$1.85.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, the gentleman has not quite stated all of it. After he got his wire nails down to \$1.85 he neglected to state the point to which they have risen since.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I think the price of wire nails at the present time is about \$2.20 or \$2.30.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And that rise began to take place immediately upon the formation of the wire-nail trust?

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. Well, I would not be surprised if that were true.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, in further answer to what the gentleman has said, this is also true: While wire nails have gone down here, upon the whole, in price—and he has substantially stated the history of their going down, with the omission which he has just corrected—it is also true that wire nails made in Belgium and in Great Britain have gone down exactly in the same proportion, and it is also true (which the gentleman has failed to mention) that while wire nails are being sold now in the United States at the price which he has given American wire nails are being sold in Cape Colony, a British possession, transported by the back door of Great Britain, and are, or were a year ago, sold there at a price far below what they are sold for in the American market.

The answer proves two things: First, the American tariff has had nothing to do with the reduction of the price of wire nails, except to impede the process, as is demonstrated by the fact that they have gone down where no tariff existed, and, secondly, the tariff has had something to do with enabling the American producer of wire nails to fix a higher price than was necessary to the American consumer in a sheltered market while he sells at reasonable profit to the subjects of Great Britain in Cape Colony.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I will say to the gentleman from Mississippi that the position he assumes is entirely untenable, and I place before the gentleman now the challenge that has been made time and time and time again, that no Democrat living has yet cited a single manufactured article upon which there is a protective tariff that is not lower in price to-day than it was the day the tariff was placed on the article. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true, and the answer to it is true.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to hear these gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I ask the pardon of the gentleman from Florida, and will simply say that I was led to rise and interrupt him because of his statement that the effect of levying a protective tariff was to increase the price of the article by the amount of the tariff.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I understand, and I yielded to both gentlemen with great pleasure, because I have time enough to get through with the few remarks that I want to make, and I am always very glad to hear both of them. But I do not care to discuss particular items, and I have not prepared a tariff speech. I stated in the beginning the reason why I never attempted to make one, and I simply want to call attention to one or two general propositions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida will pardon me, this is pertinent and it will not take long. I read from a list given in the Exporters and Importers' Journal of June 18, 1904, published by Henry W. Peabody, 17 State street, New York City, and I find on that list that the export price of barbed wire per hundred pounds was at that time \$2.20 and the home price \$2.70, with a difference of 23 cents per hundred, and upon black fence wire, per hundred pounds, the export price was \$1.25 and the home price \$2, with a difference of 60 cents per hundred. I will ask the gentleman to answer that.

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. What does that prove?

Mr. WILLIAMS. It proves enough for you, unless you can deny it, or get around it, or evade it, to defeat you in the next election. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CHARLES B. LANDIS. I can not see how it is relevant at all.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to submit a few general propositions. I have not investigated these isolated items, but, Mr. Chairman, I am undertaking to argue from reason and a common-sense view of these propositions, and I

can not for the life of me understand how it is that a duty can be levied upon an article imported into this country, where it will come into competition in the open market with other articles of like character grown in this country, and not increase the price of the article to the consumer. If it does not do that, then the American business man is not the shrewd, calculating individual that we have always given him credit for being, and the Republican party's boast of protecting American industries and American labor vanishes into thin air.

Why, Mr. Chairman, in the very nature of things, when goods are imported into the United States upon which duties are paid and which compete in the American market with domestic goods it must inevitably have the effect of increasing the cost to the purchaser and benefit the person who has goods of that character for sale. I think, Mr. Chairman, there can be no escape from it. There may be an isolated case here and there where the price of the article has not increased, due to combinations of one kind or another—due to some kind of trade relation or agreement—but the effect is, the logical effect is, and the inevitable effect is, to increase the price of the article approximately to the extent of the duty collected.

Now, Mr. Chairman, recognizing this to be true, recognizing the undeniable fact, as I take it, that in the collection of tariff on imports some of our people must be burdened with the tax and some of our people must be benefited on account of its levy and collection, it seems to me that the true policy of statesmanship would demand a system by which and in the operation of which the burdens and the benefits should be so distributed as to affect all classes of the people as nearly alike as possible and not to enrich a few favored manufacturers at the expense of the great masses of the people.

That is my position in this House, Mr. Chairman, on this question, and I am going to get to my own bill now in a few moments. The farmer, the producer of the raw material, should share in the benefits of this system of taxation along with the manufacturer.

If benefits are to be derived, and you can not prevent it, it is idle to talk about levying a tariff and benefiting nobody. It is folly to talk about levying import duties upon various articles and benefiting nobody in America having those articles for sale. You must benefit them. They will be benefited. So I say that the system ought to be so framed, the tariff schedule ought to be so drawn, as to give the farmer, the producer, who earns his bread in the sweat of his face beneath a June and July sun, some of the benefits while the protected manufacturer is being made richer and richer as the years go by.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Then, I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman does not agree with the last declaration of the Democratic party, of 1904.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I would like to quote that declaration, if the gentleman will let me have it. I looked for it this morning, but could not find it.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. If the gentleman will pardon me just a moment, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] a question in the interest of the truth of history.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield for just a moment.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. In making this platform I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] was a member of the committee, which was out for sixteen hours in the convention at St. Louis, and as the platform went in to the committee it was a different document from that which came out. They were two different propositions entirely. As published in the public press when it went into the committee we find that it was as follows:

We favor a wise, conservative, and businesslike revision of the tariff made with due regard to existing conditions.

That is the way it went in, according to the public press, and when it came out the words "we favor a wise, conservative, and businesslike revision made with due regard to existing conditions" were stricken out. So that it now reads, "We favor a revision and a gradual reduction of the tariff." Which is the correct form, I would like to ask the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, it is rather unprecedented to ask a Member who is sitting down a question, but since the gentleman has asked it, and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CLARK] kindly yields, will the gentleman from Connecticut please make his question intelligible? He has asked which was the true expression.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Which is the platform of the Democratic party—that the revision should be made on a wise and intelligent basis with due regard to existing conditions, or was it to be a straight revision?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Surely it does not need one-twentieth of the intelligence which is possessed by the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] to know that the real Democratic platform as adopted was the platform as it came out of the committee.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I understood it was reported to the convention the other way.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, if these gentlemen will permit me, I will read what the gentleman from Connecticut furnishes me and what I think was the Democratic platform on this question in 1904:

We denounce protection as a robbery of the many to enrich the few, and we favor a tariff limited to the needs of the Government economically administered and so levied as not to discriminate against any industry, class, or section to the end that the burdens of taxation shall be distributed as equally as possible.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I would like to ask the gentleman squarely if he thinks a tax of 10 cents a pound on cotton is not purely a protective tariff.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I am coming to that in a moment. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Democratic convention, in that platform, said, "We denounce protection as a robbery," and that is what these gentlemen harp on continually. What protection were they denouncing as a robbery? There can not be a single levy of a tariff without some kind of protection. That is true. It must benefit somebody, and when it benefits somebody it protects somebody. They were denouncing the protection of the Republican party, not protection pure and simple, but protection as practiced by that party; protection as levied by them to build up the great trusts that are now absolutely threatening the stability of this Government. That is the kind of protection they were denouncing as robbery, and it can not be anything else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I want now to come to my cotton proposition—the little infant that my friend from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL] talked about the other day and that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] asked me about.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MEYER of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield ten more minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I introduced that bill with no idea of being wedded to the particular amount named in the bill. I introduced it very much upon the idea that a lawyer in drafting a declaration in a damage suit fixes the amount of his damages. He alleges \$25,000 when he perhaps expects to recover \$3,000. So I put that amount in the bill—

Mr. BOUTELL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. In a moment—in the bill, expecting that when it went to the Ways and Means Committee and when they undertook to frame a schedule that if they saw fit to put a tax upon Egyptian cotton at all they would put an amount that would be reasonable and just and produce a revenue for the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That, Mr. Chairman, was—

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That was subject to a percentage of reduction—

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Characteristic of all arguments made upon your side on this proposition, equally ad damnum in their character.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There was some confusion in the Hall, but as I understood the gentleman he said he expected that committee to reduce this rate or to make this rate whatever would be a revenue rate and not prohibitive in its character; and that he himself would not favor a prohibitive or a rate for protection?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Surely. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention just a moment to these figures. In 1901 there were 34,735,682 pounds of Egyptian cotton imported into this country. In the year 1902, 81,325,158 pounds were imported; in 1903, 63,554,773 pounds were imported; in 1904, 39,249,878 pounds were imported; in 1905, 52,436,673 pounds were imported.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if a duty of 5 cents per pound were levied upon that cotton, it would have produced in 1901 a revenue of \$1,736,784.10. At 2 cents a pound it would have produced a revenue of \$694,713.64. In 1902 a duty of 5 cents per pound would have produced a revenue of \$4,066,257.90, and at 2 cents per pound would have produced a revenue of \$1,626,503.16. In 1903 a duty of 5 cents per pound would have produced a revenue of \$3,177,738.65, and at 2 cents per pound would have

produced a revenue of \$1,271,095.46. In 1904 a duty of 5 cents per pound would have produced a revenue of \$1,962,493.90, or at 2 cents per pound would have produced a revenue of \$784,997.16. In 1905 at 5 cents a pound it would have produced a revenue of \$2,621,833.65, or at 2 cents a pound it would have produced a revenue of \$1,048,733.46.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. And according to the gentleman's own theory it would have raised the price of every pound of cotton grown in the United States precisely according to the amount of duty.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Not at all.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. I understood you to make that claim.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No; because, Mr. Chairman, this bill seeks to put the duty upon what we know as "long staple cotton." There is not any of it grown, so far as the Agricultural Department shows, anywhere in this country except in South Carolina, Georgia, and Florida.

Mr. HILL of Connecticut. Well, it would have raised the price of all that is grown.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Certainly. It would have raised the price, in my judgment, of all the sea-island or long-staple cotton that is grown in this country. It would have given the long-staple grower the benefit of that raise, Mr. Chairman; but I have just been contending that when his New England brother in Connecticut gets the benefit of the tariff upon the manufactured cotton goods, he in Florida ought to get some of that same benefit of Government, if benefit there must be. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is all I am asking for, Mr. Chairman. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BOUTELL. I would like to ask two or three questions in reference to this cotton.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Well, I have only about three minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUTELL. First, the gentleman from Florida is absolutely sure that none of this long-staple cotton is grown in the State of Mississippi?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. The Government reports show it is only grown in the three States I have named.

Mr. BOUTELL. According to the Government reports, there is no long-staple cotton grown anywhere in the State of Mississippi?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. No sea-island cotton; I think there is none grown except in those three States.

Mr. BOUTELL. I will ask further whether a tax of 5 cents a pound or even 10 cents a pound would in any way effect the price of the short cotton?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I do not think it will. I do not think that the millions of bales of short cotton would be effected in the slightest degree.

Mr. BOUTELL. I could not see how they would be, even to the fraction of a mill.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

Mr. CLARK of Florida. I have only about a minute.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we can get more time. I think anything like a large duty upon Egyptian cotton would effect the price of short cotton, and would effect it by reducing pro tanto the price of short cotton.

Egyptian cottons are imported into this country solely for the purpose of being mixed with short cotton in the production of certain lines of goods. Their importation, therefore, creates a market here to a certain extent for the short cotton itself for the manufacture of those peculiar lines of goods. The Egyptian is a cream-colored cotton, and it goes into nankeen goods of various sorts and into other goods which my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] will recall. So if it had any effect upon short cotton at all it would be a very slight effect, and it would be an effect to restrict its market, and therefore to the same extent decrease its price.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to state another fact as I understand it. The great bulk of this cotton is grown in Florida and South Carolina and in Georgia, and is manufactured—a great deal of it, at least—into the finer laces. I am told, further, that there are no factories, even in New England, that manufacture these fine laces, and that the great body of this product is sent to France and manufactured there and sent back here and sold to us at enormous prices.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have undertaken to make my position plain. I am not a free trader. I do not hesitate to say that if the Democratic party should declare for free trade to-morrow I would quit it on the spot. [Applause.] I look upon it as being absolute folly to talk about running the Government with a direct tax upon the people. It can not be done. So we are in favor of a tariff to run the expenses of the Government, eco-

nomically, but not niggardly, administered. And I am in favor of so levying that tariff, Mr. Chairman, as that the farmer, the producer, will be benefited along with the manufacturer. Somebody has got to get the benefit of the tariff. When my friend from Connecticut [Mr. HILL] is getting the benefit of it, or his people are getting the benefit of it in these protected industries, when they who are manufacturing the cotton grown in our fields are getting the benefit, at least a portion of the blessing should come to the farmer who raises it. I say give the farmer a little whack at it, give him a little of the benefit. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is my position, and I think it is the Democratic position. Equalize the burdens, distribute the favors, help the farmer while you help the manufacturer. I am not wedded to a 10-cent duty, I am wedded to no particular duty; but I am wedded to that duty which will produce a revenue, which shall not be prohibitive, but which at the same time will give my people some of the benefits of government to which they are entitled under this system of taxation while forced to bear its burdens.

I thank the committee. [Applause.]

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHACKLEFORD].

Mr. SHACKLEFORD. Mr. Chairman, on several occasions during this session I have spoken in criticism of the methods and practices by which the Speaker represses the membership of the House. I have undertaken to show that ours is no longer a representative Government; that in defiance of the Constitution and the rules the Speaker exercises an absolute veto power over all legislation proposed here; that instead of being, as the Constitution contemplates he should, the servant of the House, the Speaker has constituted himself its master. I have laid out for my task to make it an issue before the country whether he shall not be required to give back to the people their free representative Government. I am gratified to find a hearty response to this call to arms. I will read a few extracts from the press from various sections of the country to show that the people are coming into a realization of the fact that Members of this House are no longer allowed to represent the people who sent them here, but must bend to the will of the Speaker. The following is from the Pasadena News:

THE AMERICAN CZAR.

Representative DORSEY W. SHACKLEFORD, of Missouri, made complaint yesterday against the absolutism of the Speaker on what must be recognized as well-taken grounds. Authority to prevent Members from blocking business—even so arbitrary authority as the counting of a quorum not present—is less repugnant than the exercise of a Speaker's authority to unduly influence the course of business and the action of the House. The specific complaint of Representative SHACKLEFORD was that the Speaker had packed the Ways and Means Committee with "ten men who would stand pat as men of stone against any and every attempt to amend the tariff." He went on to declare that if the stand-patters would come out into the open they would not stand the ghost of a show, but that is neither here nor there. Neither does it matter whether the committee was packed not to amend or to amend the tariff. The objectionable principle is that one man, entitled to one vote, attempts indirectly to say what the House shall and what it shall not consider.

There is too much such arbitrary action by committees not specially selected. Only last week there was refusal to report, even adversely, the Philippine tariff bill. So it is that our legislation is not by Congress, but by the Speaker of the Congress and his committees. Why should the country not be entitled to the benefit of action by the whole Congress after full consideration and debate, as contemplated by the Constitution?

Uncle JOE CANNON is a mighty clever old man and the most popular personality in the House, but that does not satisfy the country at large for the exercise of extra and unusual powers. In personal appeals for support of measures the Speaker wields an immense influence, and this influence was exerted to the utmost in behalf of the joint statehood bill. Herein is another illustration of the pernicious extraneous growths that spring up in practice to destroy the purity of the Government as it was planned. Representative SHACKLEFORD's assertion that no man in monarchical Europe exercises such absolute jurisdiction as the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the democratic United States has plenty of corroborative testimony to support it. The question is, why are these admitted evils which have crept into our system not corrected when they are so clearly seen?

Here is from an editorial in the Kansas City Journal, a staunch Republican organ:

Representative SHACKLEFORD may have lost prestige in the House by his plain talk to CANNON, but he has earned respect and admiration of the country. He told the truth, and did it bravely.

I read from the Columbia (Mo.) Daily Tribune:

Not only the statehood bill, but no measure is allowed to come before Congress unless it has the approval of the Speaker, and no Representative can secure recognition unless his bill is satisfactory and he has previously made his peace with Speaker CANNON.

Such tactics have been pursued before, always by Republicans, but not to the insolent extent to which Speaker CANNON has carried his methods. That it is a menace to representative government, if continued, is plain without argument. Congressman SHACKLEFORD has repeatedly called attention to the unprecedented action of the Speaker and the results of his methods.

The following is from the Ohio State Journal, a staunch Republican paper of extensive influence:

Representative SHACKLEFORD made a bitter attack on Speaker CANNON on the floor of the House the other day. Nothing in the palmy

days of Speaker Reed's occupancy of the chair exceeded Mr. SHACKLEFORD's speech in sharp, personal attack. "Unbridled will," "an enthroned despot," "crack your whip," "cowers at your feet," are some of the phrases that stuck out like bayonets from the speech.

Such an arraignment was expected sooner or later. As wise as Speaker CANNON is, as patriotic, he must not think he can escape assault for his arbitrary rule. Our theory of government does not provide anywhere for a censor over legislation. Really, it is a challenge to a republican form of government to hold that it is necessary.

Mr. SHACKLEFORD charged that "you have packed every committee so that no bill can be reported without your consent." This accusation seems to be true; at least that is the popular belief. This is not righteous legislative theory. The Speaker should not be the sole judge, and it does show some sycophancy on the part of his party adherents when they permit it. Why, isn't that indignation in its unadulterated form?

The occasion for this outburst of indignation was the dictatorial manner that Mr. CANNON assumed with reference to the statehood bill. He didn't like the change the Senate made in the House bill. Now, it is not possible that the Senate will always injure a House bill, and in this particular case there is an extended public opinion that it did not, but that, on the other hand, it improved it. And so, in this case of Mr. SHACKLEFORD's attack, while there may not be an extended indorsement of its violence and ascription, there is considerable sympathy in its purpose, and we have no doubt that many Congressmen who are saying nothing and saving wood smile fondly when they sit alone before their own firesides and think of that speech.

I read now from the Locomotive Firemen's Magazine:

DESOTISM IN CONGRESS.

The employers' liability bill has passed the National House of Representatives. Should it become a law as it now stands, damages can not be recovered by a railroad employee's parents unless it can be proven that they were dependent on him. This feature is embodied in the words "dependent upon him," appearing in the first section. This is, of course, a gross and crying injustice to a railroad man's parents. It classes as of no consequence and altogether unworthy of consideration or attempted compensation the harrowing grief and heart-rending sorrow in which the poor old mother of a slaughtered railroad man bends over his mangled form, and provides that unless she was "dependent on him" at the time of his death she shall be entitled to no indemnity, as though the loss of his association, of his sympathy, or of his support and protection in case that want should overtake her ought not to entitle her to damages.

The friends of the measure, in their attempt to secure the elimination of this outrageous provision, brought to light a condition of affairs which clearly demonstrates the tyrannical despotism with which corporation tools rule the national legislative body of the United States. The National House of Representatives is supposed to be, and under the Constitution should be, a deliberative body, but the procedure in this case clearly demonstrates that it is an oligarchy of the most pronounced type. It was sought by those desiring to improve the measure after it left the committee's hands to have it amended on the floor of the House when it came up for passage so that the parents would not have to prove dependency. The report of the incident is to the effect that to this "the Speaker would not consent," giving as his reason that Mr. LITTLEFIELD came to him a few days ago, saying that he was going away, and that he hoped the Speaker "would not permit the bill to be amended on the floor." This man LITTLEFIELD is a Member of Congress from Maine, and since his advent into Congress has, save a few bluffs at trust "busting," persistently opposed all legislation in the interest of labor and the people generally. He has doggedly and strenuously opposed this just measure both in committee and out, and would not, could he prevent it, have the bill to pass even in its present form.

CANNON, the Speaker, true to his compact with LITTLEFIELD, would not permit the offering of the desired amendment. It may be asked, how could he prevent the amendment from being offered? How could he tell what a Member was going to say when he recognized him on the floor? The answer to this is that no Member is recognized to call up a bill without first "fixing" it with the Speaker. He must first go to the Speaker and advise him as to the nature of the bill he desires to call up, including the amendments, if any, which he wishes to offer. If agreeable to the latter gentleman the Member is promised recognition on a certain day and at a certain time.

If the bill is objectionable to the Speaker he will not agree to recognize him for the purpose of moving its passage. And should any of the proposed amendments meet with the disapproval of this "lord" of the House, as was the case in this instance, he will not agree to recognize the Member having charge of the bill unless he agrees to not offer such amendment, and to oppose it on the floor should any other Member propose it. If he will not agree to this "star chamber" proposition all the howling he can do on the floor of the House will avail him nothing in securing recognition.

So it can, therefore, be seen how Mr. CANNON carried out his compact with LITTLEFIELD to crucify the interests of the parents of employees in this particular while LITTLEFIELD was absent from his public duties.

What is America drifting to when a corporation dishwasher can by his mere request prevent the enactment of legislation that involves the interests of some millions of its citizens? What is America drifting to when a tool of monopoly can by the intimation of a desire block the wheels of our legislative machinery in the interest of wealth, and have arbitrarily denied to the people's representatives in Congress the right to seek the enactment or amendment of laws in their behalf? Think of the thousands of railroad men's poor parents who may suffer gross injustice as a result of the diabolical conspiracy whereby they are thus discriminated against because his occupation classes him as a "railroad employee." The parents of a passenger (who does not wear the tag of railroad employee) can recover if he is killed, but Speaker CANNON and Member LITTLEFIELD, by virtue of the authority they have assumed and which they enjoy as a result of the prostitution of their sacred trust and the past indifference of the people, have decreed that railroad employees shall not enjoy the protection of the law as other citizens do, thus establishing rank discrimination against a particular class because—because what? Because the influence of corporations and wealth generally is greater than theirs—that is the only reason.

One JOE CANNON, of Danville, Ill., representing the Eighteenth district of that State, and one CHARLES E. LITTLEFIELD, from the Second district of Maine, accomplished this in one brief conversation. Could the Czar of Russia do more? Is it necessary to warn these gentlemen who, in their zeal to serve the money power, seem to have become oblivious of that fact, that they are not dealing with ignorant hordes of Russian peasantry who possess nothing but clubs or old flintlock guns

wherewith to resist the power of autocracy?

Is it necessary to call their attention to the fact that they are conspiring against and trampling on the rights of hundreds of thousands of enlightened American citizens, each one of whom is armed, not with a club or flintlock gun, but with a ballot, by the proper use of which he can relegate to eternal oblivion the whole tribe of plutocratic usurpers who are bartering that birthright of constitutional liberty and equal rights guaranteed him by the blood of Revolutionary warfare? Do they know that the people are awakening? Do they realize that the people are free? Do they appreciate that railroad men are part of the people? If not, they soon will. What has the party of which these men are members got to say to the railroad men of this country in extenuation of this outrage on their constitutional rights? Does it propose to offer LITTLEFIELD and CANNON again for the suffrages of railroad employees? Will it seek the reelection of such enemies of our interests, and thereby demonstrate that it regards President Roosevelt—to whose every principle of reform this element in Congress is diametrically opposed—as being too much of a people's man and not just suitable for "political" purposes? If it retain control of the next House, does it propose to reenthroned CANNON and at his dictation re-adapt the present arbitrary rules of the House which make him the sole dictator of legislation? Political parties are but a means to an end. That the people are getting to realize this fact the immense independent vote in recent elections clearly demonstrates. Patriotism, love of good, clean government, and honesty in public office are fast superseding party "loyalty" and party "fidelity." America is awakening to such an extent that the officeholder and office seeker must stand on their merits. The day is fast passing when they can successfully hide their misdeeds behind party identity and hypnotize their constituents by crying for fealty to the "dear" party, "the party that has made our country what it is"—whatever that party may be—and return to office that they may continue to betray the people. The people will stand by the man in office who represents them honestly. They are demanding a square deal. Railroad men, and their relatives are a part of the "people."

The employers' liability bill is now before the Senate, and, of course, every effort will be made to kill it in committee through the process of interminable, protracted, and oft-continued hearings. If the committee finally reports it for passage, attempts will be made to destroy its efficacy by amending it in the interests of railroad companies—in fact, every expedient known to legislative trickery will be resorted to to prevent its passage or render it useless if it does pass. Consequently every lodge should correspond with the Senators from its State and our members should write personal letters urging those gentlemen to support it, and giving them to understand that the railroad wage-earners of the country are very much in earnest in seeking its enactment.

I will not take the time of the House to read more, but I might cite hundreds of others from leading papers of all parties condemning in unmeasured terms the methods by which this House is controlled and the voice of the people suppressed. It is useless to talk of measures for the relief of the people as long as one man sits here exercising unlimited control over the people's representatives. The people must first recover their Government before they can hope to have it conducted in their behalf. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That no quorum is present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will proceed to count. [After counting.] There are 111 Members present. Therefore the point of order is overruled.

Mr. FOSS. I yield one hour to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, in opposing our naval policy, it is not my desire to criticize the members of the Committee on Naval Affairs for their action in reporting the pending bill. They have labored long and successfully for a reduction of expenses. They have brought in a measure which promises a check upon the ambitious and extravagant naval programme which has found so many advocates during the last four or five years. If they have been at fault in recommending an excessive amount for the construction of battle ships, a principal reason has been their opinion that in doing so they were responding to the will of the majority of the American people. There are many of us who have at some time yielded to the jingo spirit, when, if we had relied upon our own judgment, we should have favored a more conservative policy. President McKinley waited long before recommending action which led to the war with Spain. It was his desire to avert a conflict, but 70,000,000 of people demanded that we take up the sword.

It is with a hope to promote the cause of peace and to diminish the careless disregard of the calamities of war that I desire to address the House to-day. I shall give but passing notice to several valid objections to the present naval programme. One is its great expense, which has so increased that in the last four years it has exceeded by \$50,000,000 that of the four years of the civil war. In the year 1905 there was expended upon the Navy \$117,000,000, an amount four times as great as in 1896 and seven times as great as in 1888, and once and three-fourths as much as the total of all our national expenses in 1860. Although we are said not to be a military people, the cost of the naval and military establishments, with that of the pension list, a legacy of war, now approximates two-thirds of all the expenses of the United States Government. Other objections are that the construction of war ships is far outstripping the supply of men to equip them; also there is reason for apprehension that the

Navy will not have either the homogeneity or that proportion of different kinds of ships which will best subserve the demands of the future should any unfortunate contest arise.

Under the five-minute rule I may address the committee with reference to the proposed additional battle ship. There is grave danger that if one of such a model is constructed, larger than any of those in the existing Navy, an almost overwhelming pressure will be brought to bear to replace the present battle ships, of which twenty-nine have been provided, with those of this larger model. We already have a Navy so formidable that it is far in advance of any reasonable present or prospective needs, and it is probable that nearly all of them will rust away without having fired a shot except for target practice. In saying this I do not take the position of the idealist who believes that wars are past. There will no doubt be occasional collisions between nations. There will exist a necessity for quelling disorders in foreign countries and for the protection of American citizens against injustice or violence. The world has not reached the golden age of peace, and yet every tendency is in that direction. It must be so in the very nature of the case. A potent factor in the abatement of war is the increasing attention of civilized nations to the pursuits of industry and commerce. Those who are engaged in these pursuits seek to prevent war, just as sanitary science guards against pestilence. Then, again, with the growth of the human intellect, with the absorption of men in intellectual pursuits, and with the increased influence of moral forces, war seems more and more appalling. Nations no longer exist for the sovereign; sovereigns must exist for the nation. The State may be supreme, but the individual is more and more year by year and generation by generation. "Nations," it has been said, "are now conquered not by armies, but by ideas."

But for the inertia which pertains to great political reforms war would have already disappeared. It is a striking fact that the political movements do not show the same orderly development or the same rational and uniform progress as the triumphs of science and of industry. Peoples are often kept back from wholesome advancement by the influence of favored classes, who are strongly intrenched in the possession of privileges, which they strive to retain. There is frequently a conservative element which stands by the traditions of the old régime, however objectionable they may be. So when the cobwebs which time has gathered are brushed away, the greatest achievement of a popular government will be to uproot some evil or remove some obstacle which stands athwart the onward march of progress. If we were to study our own political history, probably we all would agree that the most notable feature in the whole record was the destruction of the institution of human slavery rather than any affirmative achievement.

But governments, in their relations with their citizens and in their relations with other countries, must follow the march of public opinion. They can not linger long behind. On this subject a great historical writer has said, in words which are as applicable to war as to any abuse:

Every system must fall if it opposes the march of opinions and gives shelter to maxims and institutions repugnant to the spirit of the age. In this sort of contest the result is never doubtful.

Then, after speaking of the dependence of certain systems on human life:

* * * But the vigor of public opinion is not exposed to these casualties. It is unaffected by the laws of mortality; it does not flourish to-day and decline to-morrow; and so far from depending on the lives of individual men it is governed by large general causes which from their very comprehensiveness are in short periods scarcely seen, but on a comparison of long periods are found to outweigh all other considerations.

The manifest tendency in long periods toward a decrease of war is illustrated by the facts of history. In the first place, the attacks of barbarians upon civilized peoples, which caused such devastation in the olden time, have ceased. There are no longer any such incursions as those of the Goths and the Vandals, the Scythians and the Huns. With the invention of gunpowder and the progress of modern invention, science is made the handmaid of war. The barbarian must discover, if he attacks a civilized people, that he is confronted by superior implements of destruction and by the advantages which belong to discipline and to accumulated resources. Thus no uncivilized people will attack a civilized one unless actuated by the temerity of ignorance or the recklessness of despair. The uncivilized tribe or the barbarian may find refuge in inaccessible fastnesses or be protected by a pestilential climate, but the great invasions by them which brought such calamity, in which cities were sacked and nations overturned, can never again occur.

Then, too, religious wars, at least between different branches of the Christian church, have ceased. Practically they came to an end with the peace of Westphalia, in the year 1648, after the Thirty Years' war. This does not mean that at all times and in

all countries since then religious toleration has existed or that religious differences have not aggravated the bitterness of conflicts, but nations have ceased to war with each other on account of religion. The struggles in which the religious issue is involved are now confined to contests with Mohammedan or with Pagan, whose warlike spirit is fostered by the bitter fanaticism which actuates the one or the other.

Wars for the aggrandizement of rulers have ceased. If a king or emperor should not find a barrier against his personal ambition in the attitude of his own country, he would surely find it in that of others. The contests which changed the map of Europe and caused the greatest calamities were largely due to the personal ambitions of sovereigns, as in the case of Louis XIV. The latest wars of this nature may be said to have been those in which Napoleon was engaged; but even he, in an important sense, was merely the embodiment or the beneficiary of an uprising by the French people. The French nation, notwithstanding frightful excesses, gained a new birth of liberty, and the other nations of Europe sought to interfere and to impose a king upon them. With that impetus for freedom which gives the greatest strength to a people, they overcame their foes, and then the glamor of Napoleon's victories led them still further on. Had it not been for the French revolution he might have entered the service of the Turk, as it is said he intended to do in his early years, and not have achieved the great career of conquest which he attained.

Another class of conflicts, those wars which are caused by uprisings of a people against the existing order and for freer government or greater privilege, are becoming less and less frequent. When men are seeking for a freer constitution, in spite of unrest and tumult it is found that the more rational way is by education and the forces of public opinion, by the establishment of legislative bodies; and thus this source of irritation and war, while not entirely disappearing from the earth, is diminishing year by year.

If we look for any date when this tendency took definite form and gained its greatest impetus, we may point to the year 1815, after the battle of Waterloo and the Napoleonic wars. Prior to that date the predominant condition in Europe was one of constant struggle between contending nations. Since then the predominant condition has been one of peace. The nations of Europe had found by bitter experience, by bloodshed, and by woe that war was a suicidal policy. The Holy Alliance, which has been criticised as having been formed for unholy purposes, nevertheless recognized that it was best for the nations represented to preserve the peace. What has been the result? In the ninety-one years succeeding that year of 1815 the growth of invention and the increase of the comforts and luxuries of life have been greater than in all the centuries preceding. It was quickly followed by the development of steam and the steamboat and by the beginnings of the railway, followed later by the marvels of electricity and by all those improvements of civilization which bring practical benefit to each man's home. It was the beginning of a triumphant progress which would have been utterly impossible had war continued.

The ideas and pursuits of men have radically changed since that year, and we may rank its advent as constituting an era in the world's progress worthy to be compared with the fifteenth century, with its twin events, the invention of printing and the discovery of America; for as they made a landmark in the progress of the race, so did the disposition toward peace after the fall of Napoleon mark another advance in the same direction.

There has been a great difference in the haste with which nations go to war since then. No country can take up the sword without grave occasion or it will have the condemnation of all the rest. There have been wars in Europe within the last sixty or eighty years in which one nation has engaged in combat under a serious handicap because of the potent condemnation of the public opinion of all other countries resting upon it, because it was thought that the war was unjustifiable. Annexations of conquered territory have been limited; no civilized nation is now allowed to overrun and annex another. A balance of power is preserved. When the defeated nation is at the feet of its foe congresses gather, as at Berlin in 1878, or the result of the victory is limited, as by the concert of action of three nations after Japan had defeated China in 1894. In the former case the acquisitions of territory by Russia from Turkey were restricted to a very small amount of land. In the latter case, in 1895, after China agreed upon a treaty giving territory on the mainland of Asia to Japan, three nations intervened and denied the right to take it. Acquisitions have often been limited to territory to which the victorious nation had some claim lasting, perhaps, for centuries, as was the case in 1866, when Prussia acquired Schleswig-Holstein; in 1859 and

1866, when Italy acquired, respectively, Lombardy and Venice, and in 1870, after the overwhelming victory of Prussia over France, when only Alsace and Lorraine were ceded.

It is an undisputed fact that the greatest growth in the strength of nations in the last forty years has not been the result of war, but has been illustrated in cases such as those of Italy and Germany, in which separate peoples of kindred blood have united in one great nation. True the sword had something to do with the uniting of each of these countries, but it had more to do in keeping them in a dismembered state, for the arms of Austria for a long time prevented a united Italy, and the severed states of Germany were largely the result of thirty years of war more than two hundred years ago. This shows that wars stood in the way of national unity, and the people themselves, by their patriotic impulse to be one, gained that power and prestige which come from a united empire.

We should ever keep in mind the analogy between the settlement of disputes between individuals and the settlement of controversies between nations. The feudal barons of the old time did not say that they must have war ships to protect their interests, because there were no war ships in that time. They did not say that they must have a strong navy, but they did require vassals, who must keep constantly under arms, and strongly fortified castles, so every hill was crowned with a fortress, every passageway over a river was defended by some baron, partly for military purposes and partly so that he might levy tribute. These feudal lords would not admit that the maintenance of armed dependents and fortresses was for the sake of aggression. The argument of the modern day that a large navy is required to preserve peace and for defense was used by them hundreds of years ago. Nevertheless they were frequently engaged in contests. They did not yield to the authority of the magistrate who sought to preserve order or give respect to the priest who sought to preserve peace, but this system was compelled to yield to a civilization in which there is a rule of law and in which brute force must give way. So the castles were dismantled or abandoned and there was substituted for force and lawlessness a rule of justice and order, under which the strong and the weak alike submitted their controversies to a tribunal which was to decide what was justice between them. No one now is in favor of going back to the old system where each man by his sword sought to enforce his rights and in which the duel was the common means for seeking personal redress.

All recognize the establishment of courts of justice to decide controversies between individuals as a great landmark in the progress of civilization. Another step just as inevitable is the establishment of similar courts as between nations. The world can not afford to maintain these military armaments. Their decrease and abandonment will not come in a year, but it will come. I would say nothing to-day against a Navy which, man for man and gun for gun, is one of the best in the world, or as I hope it may be the best in the world. I would say nothing against a state of preparedness. What I do say is that to maintain this great Navy is not in accordance with our best ideals, nor is it in accordance with our best interests, material or otherwise. [Applause.] And that instead of spending \$100,000,000 a year this country of ours should take the lead in the cause of peace among the nations, a leadership which should belong to us, and which we ought to maintain. [Applause.] We are not lacking in strength for peace or for war. We possess that great abundance of resources which belongs to a people occupying a land yielding a great variety of products. In case of war between other nations the warring countries would seek to protect our commerce rather than to prey upon it, because they would need the products of our fields and of our mines. Thus we do not need a great Navy for our protection.

As regards leadership in the cause of peace and arbitration, I can not avoid the conclusion that with a republican form of government, with the stress laid upon free institutions, with the absence of those ambitions for conquest that more naturally attach themselves to a monarchy, we have a far better opportunity to avoid disputes ourselves and to aid in securing the settlement of the world's disputes by peaceful methods than any other nation on the globe could have.

Mr. Chairman, the chiefest glory of the Administration of Theodore Roosevelt, when it becomes a part of history, and his chiefest glory as an individual, will not be his part in San Juan Hill or in the many great events in which he has shown such splendid leadership; his greatest distinction will not be that he was elected by such an overwhelming plurality to the Presidential chair, the highest office on the globe, but that by his offices bloodshed was stayed and the war between the two countries of Japan and Russia was brought to an end. [Applause.] This is enough to make nations of all climes and of all continents rise

up and call him blessed. His efforts were made the more efficient by the fact that he spoke for a free Republic, a Republic which had no ambition to subvert in the theater of that frightful war except those of a peaceful nature.

Just as there has been very great progress in doing away with war, so there has been equal progress in the peaceful settlement of disputes, especially in the last ninety years. From 1815 to 1900 more than 200 controversies between nations were settled by arbitration. Since 1900 there have been 40 more, and each successive bulletin adds to the list. In these the United States was a party in a very considerable share. These arbitrations have settled the most irritating questions, not only questions of boundary, of indignities to citizens, of property and personal rights, but all the great range of questions which in the olden times were incitements to war.

Among the countries which have resorted to arbitration there are not merely those of Europe and of North and South America, but also those of Asia, such as Persia and Afghanistan, and of Africa, such as the Transvaal Republic and Egypt. We are just at the beginning, as it would seem, of this manner of settlement of controversies in a peaceful way, especially since beginning in 1902 or 1903, as with a beam of light there has been a great movement for arbitration treaties in Europe and in America. These treaties not only provide for the settlement of existing controversies, but look to the avoidance of future collisions. England has entered into a treaty of arbitration with France, and both England and France with Italy and Spain. Numerous others have been framed in which it is true there is the reservation that the disputes submitted for decision shall not include questions of honor or independence or of vital interest, but in pursuance of these treaties long-standing controversies of wide-reaching importance have been submitted to courts of arbitration. In 1899 The Hague conference was called, and while it adjourned without accomplishing as satisfactory results as was hoped, it did provide for a general court of arbitration between nations, to which our own country has submitted a controversy with Mexico, which was amicably settled in a way which, if it did not give absolute satisfaction to both countries, at least has met with the cordial acquiescence of each, and this gives promise of the submission of further questions. Denmark and Holland have ratified a treaty agreeing to submit to arbitration any and all grounds of controversy without limitation, thereby assuring perpetual peace between these two countries. Neither of them can be regarded as lacking in martial spirit.

More than a thousand years ago the Danes held possession of the city of London and overran England. Holland came very near to capturing London as late as 1667, by sending her fleet up the Thames. This treaty was not an act of weakness on the part of these two peoples. They were rather keeping step with the progress of the age. On the South American continent, Chile and the Argentine Republic have agreed upon an arbitration treaty in the same terms and of the same scope, and as a memorial of it they have erected on the highest ridge of the Andes, on the boundary between the two countries, a statue of the Prince of Peace to commemorate the day when the two countries vowed that for all time peace and good will should prevail between them. Those opposing any abatement of the naval programme tell us, "Why, you can not say that wars have ceased; look at the terrible conflict between Japan and Russia that is so fresh in all our minds." But this is readily explained. There have been numerous conflicts between nations for the acquisition of the territory of less advanced countries. In times past these conflicts have been a fruitful source of war. Military operations have still continued for overrunning the waste places of the earth or the land of the less civilized tribes of Africa and other continents. Spheres of influence have been agreed upon—Germany with England, and both with France—and this gradual subjection of the uncivilized peoples of the earth by nations desiring to extend the area of their colonies has been going on for many years. But Russia was in a position altogether different from any of the rest. The expansion of France, of England, and of Germany must be over the sea, but the field of expansion for Russia was overland. Asia lay at her feet, and she might very naturally say, "Asia is mine." A great Russian railway traversed the northern part of Asia; another ran east from the Caspian Sea, and it seemed but a question of time when all this territory belonging to the inferior peoples would come under her control. But as Herodotus said of the balance of power between Europe and Asia more than two thousand years ago, "The pendulum swings backward and forward between the two," and a power arose in Japan which challenged the expansion of Russia. If Asia should gradually come under the control of the great Muscovite empire, Japan saw that its independence must be lost; so

Russia must not be allowed to go on unchecked. The people of Japan, after making marvelous strides in civilization, arose actuated with one idea—defense against a probable invader—and the result was the war. But it is not likely that further contests will occur between the two.

It is proposed that The Hague conference shall reconvene. I trust when it does meet the influence of this country will be in favor of the settlement of all national controversies by arbitration. [Applause.]

It sometimes seems that there is a readier excitement of the martial spirit in this country than in others. We have not the vivid realization which comes from the constant maintenance of a burdensome military and naval establishment, from the quartering of soldiers in our neighborhood. We have not the recent memories of thousands slain in war. And the absence of these sobering influences leads many to think lightly of armaments and of war. Had the fleet of a foreign country with which our relations were strained fired upon the fishermen of Gloucester off the New England coast as the Russian fleet fired upon the fishermen on Dogger Bank it is to be feared that the popular outcry for war would have been almost irresistible. But we can not close our eyes to the increased burden of expense which is resting heavily upon us or to the fact that, instead of looking forward to the rising sun, so long as we talk for war we are looking backward.

It has been said in this discussion that by this naval programme we were showing to the nations of the earth that we are going to protect our interests. Who is threatening our interests in the wide world? Where is there a sentiment in any nation that has one warlike note against the United States? The more we abstain from military armaments, the more we abstain from everything that looks toward aggression or the preparation for aggression, the more our interests will be respected in the rest of the world, the more we will be trusted and the greater will be our progress and the friendship for us among all the nations of the earth. [Applause.]

And then again, it is said that we need a navy to protect our trade. Where is there a country in Asia or Africa, or Europe or South America, where our products or manufactures are purchased because of the existence of any battle ship or cruiser of the United States?

There may be some place where somebody has seen the hull of a cruiser of the United States and then has made up his mind that he would buy a reaper from the country from which that cruiser came. If there is any such instance, however remote the place may be, I really should like to hear from it, and I trust we may learn of it in this discussion.

In this connection I wish to say a word of the work of the interparliamentary union in which there is considerable membership from this House, and which was recently presided over by our esteemed colleague [Mr. BARTHOLOMEW]. It has met twice in the last two years, and made up, as it is, of members and ex-members of legislative bodies all over the world, it has exerted a potent influence in bringing men of many nations together and devising means to promote peace and good will among the nations. It will meet again next year, at which time Russia, now having a legislative body, may be represented, and it is to be hoped that still further results may be accomplished. It is true there is one feature of the situation which is not a hopeful one, namely, the enormous preparation of all the civilized nations for war, and its ever-increasing expense, each one saying, "We do not intend to go to war, but we want to be prepared against our neighbor." Mr. Bloch, a very practical writer, after portraying in vivid language the evils of the present situation, concludes by saying:

Such are the consequences of the so-called "armed peace of Europe"—slow destruction in consequence of expenditures on preparations for war, or swift destruction in the event of war—in both events, convulsions in the social order.

But the very fact that the tension has become so great affords the strongest hope that a change is near.

An argument is very frequently made that it is necessary to have the warlike spirit and an occasional war in order to promote courage and assure bravery. Some say, "In these piping times of peace people become effeminate; the stronger and more masculine virtues can not be maintained unless there is once in a while a fight."

If that is true, we are mistaken about civilization. The barbarous tribes which are constantly at war and live on what they obtain by force rather than by industry are fortunate, indeed, for they are constantly habituated by their surroundings to deeds of daring and to trials of their strength. If the argument referred to is valid, the old feudal times of which I have spoken were better than the present, for then every home was fortified and the thought of morning and of evening was of conflict. Is it not true that life has enough of emergencies and of

tragedies to develop the heroism of a people without compelling the flower of its youth to stand in line to be shot at and to shoot?

Last January, in addressing a convention which had under consideration the improvement of the waterways of the country, I called attention to an act of heroism on the preceding day in the rescue of the crew and passengers from the stranded steamer *Cherokee*, off Absecon Inlet, in New Jersey. This passenger steamer had grounded some miles out at sea and a fearful storm arose. No tug could pull it off, and no lifeboat could be floated. The life-saving crew could not take off the passengers. Meanwhile the billows were rising higher and higher, and it seemed to those on board on that Sunday that each would sink into a watery grave with no Sabbath bell to toll a requiem. But the officers and men of a little sailing craft went out from the shore, braving the tempest and the storm, came to the side of the boat, and by a life line conveyed the passengers and crew of the stranded steamer to their boat and sailed triumphantly into Absecon Inlet with the hurricane behind them and still waters and safety before them. The people give enthusiastic applause to a conquering general on his return from the field of conquest. The crowds shout aloud when the marching host passes by with its waving banners, but was there ever louder acclaim due to soldier or general than to these sailors who, notwithstanding their lowly lot and their limited opportunities, showed in this perilous rescue that they could be heroes in saving life rather than in destroying it? [Loud applause.]

So there is heroism outside of carnage. If people are looking for opportunities for the display of courage they will find them, and it will not be necessary to go to the tented field to develop manly qualities.

Lord Brougham in treating of the law as between individuals said:

It was the boast of Augustus that he found Rome of brick and left it of marble. But—

He added—

now much nobler will be the sovereign's boast when he shall have it to say that he found law dear and left it cheap, found it a sealed book and left it a living letter; found it the patrimony of the rich, left it the inheritance of the poor; found it the two-edged sword of craft and oppression, and left it the staff of honesty and the shield of innocence.

And now that the world is coming nearer and nearer to one common brotherhood, may I not say how much nobler yet will be that nation's distinction that found liberty the birthright of the strong alone and gave it to the weak; that found international justice a neglected principle and made it a controlling force; a nation which sought no conquest, but freely offered refuge; one which, not unmindful of national strength or honor, gained its chiefest glory in the happiness and increased opportunity of the individual citizen; a nation which found its competitors limiting their horizon to the mountains and rivers which bound them and taught them to look forth beyond all barriers and learn that all men are made of one blood and have one common destiny.

One hundred and eighty years ago Bishop Berkeley, distressed at the failure of many of the reforms which he had advocated and wearied by constant civil strife, turned his eyes toward the New World, hoping that here there would be found, if not a Utopia, at least a land of nobler traditions and ideals, and he wrote a poem prophetic in its forecast of the future America, closing with the words:

Westward the course of empire takes its way;
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day:
Time's noblest offspring is the last.

In material progress, in the general diffusion of knowledge, in the privileges and opportunities which belong to an American citizen, we have no doubt reached a plane more lofty than the good old bishop could have even hoped, but if he undertook to sing to us to-day a new song or speak to us another word, I believe it would be in this line: Enjoy, children of the New World, the luxuries, the comforts, and the privileges which I dreamed not of, but still further there remains a golden opportunity, which I trust that you may grasp. It is that mankind in this later day may look to your country, to the United States, to take the lead in the paths that lead to the world's peace. [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield one hour or so much of it as he may need to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] is recognized for one hour.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in this public place, and in the most public way, I desire to congratulate my friend from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] upon his effort. It is the best that he has made, in my judgment, since I have been a Member

of this House. [Applause.] I have not joined the Members who have shaken his hand, but I wish the Record to show that in my humble way I commend him for speaking in behalf of peace. At the same time I commend him for having, when the occasion demanded, voted with me for war. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, without reflection upon our records, and without criticism of each other for what we have done or praise each other for what we propose to do, I shall strive to reach the same conclusion as that reached by the gentleman from Ohio, but through other channels. I shall make no attempt at declamation nor deal in fine phrases; first, because of my inability, and secondly, because of my disinclination. I shall speak by the record and endeavor to prove that while we are progressing along peaceful lines and are approaching the day when all nations will reduce their armaments, yet when that day comes the result will be reached not by reason of persuasion used in the effort for peace, but because we have the means which we can employ for its enforcement.

The gentleman from Ohio pleads for settlement of international disputes by arbitration. In this appeal he is not alone. The well disposed for more than two thousand years have urged the same policy. While it is old, no one will deny its advantages to the races if it could be enforced. The gentleman speaks for the ideal life and advocates greatly to be desired conditions, but fails to prescribe a remedy for existing ones. I shall speak of man and his government as they have been, as they now are, and as they promise to be. I shall advocate means to save man from his own fury until civilized methods have tempted him to enter the ideal state.

Before I approach my subject, I venture a word for this great bill, prepared with care, and which, as you know, treats of both persons and things. It provides for the needs of the former and the care of the latter. Its purpose is not to increase, but to maintain; not to expand in size, but to promote in efficiency. While in its constant preparation the American Navy is intended to be the active, though silent, advocate of peace, its engines are designed for the destruction of human life and the infliction of terrible damage upon the property of persons and nations who may engage us in war. The sailors who sail these ships in defense of Americans and American honor are to be paid their salaries already provided for by existing law. No attempt has been made to increase the pay of any of them, nor has any addition been made to their number fixed by legislative action. All efforts in either direction have been successfully resisted; not for the reason that merit is wanting or additions unnecessary, but it was believed by the committee having the duty imposed upon it that the Treasury ought not to be taxed at this time beyond the limit herein reported and for the purposes named.

The attempt has been faithfully made to supply the personnel of our Navy with every reinforcement that will add to its comfort, secure its safety, and endow it with strength to overcome any enemy which the Congress may direct it to engage. The improvements already begun in the navy-yards have been directed to continue, but further development, except in a few imperative instances, has been denied. Stations established where our ships may stop for coal and temporary repairs have not been overlooked, but provision for them has been modest and in keeping with the retrenchment which the committee has sought to maintain.

Places where the sailor man may acquire his art have received attention and marksmanship has been encouraged. Allowances are made for ships that give notice of threatened disaster, others that will avert it. A new magazine for ammunition has been provided for, where its presence will not endanger the lives of its neighbors, but sufficiently accessible to avoid unnecessary expense of transportation. The ammunition has been increased, so that a large reserve will be immediately at hand, and an addition of guns of modern make has also been provided. Three battle ships need the attention of the builder and have been ordered to the yards. They are to be modernized under the direction of the architects, so that their complete usefulness may be again assured.

Further detail on the bill at this time will be tiresome. Its many provisions are commended by the committee that made them. Large reductions have been made on the estimates furnished, but confidence is expressed that our Navy (its personnel and its matériel) is to receive all that is absolutely necessary to maintain the efficiency which our splendid sailors have attained and to preserve its stability in both form and reputation.

Is the man with the gun an evil? If so, is he a necessary one? Whether the maintenance of great military establishments insure peace is a question no longer in dispute. It has been resolved in the negative. Does the presence of a great body of fighting men, armed with guns and swords, trained in their use,

bend the natural inclinations of men toward peace? The world has resolved this problem in the negative. But does the armed power of a nation well equipped tend to prevent war? This well-explored question the races seem to have concluded in the affirmative. If this conclusion is wrong, then, in my judgment, these enormous expenditures of public money are wrong.

The history of the old and middle ages shows that peace was usually secured upon the mountain tops of fire and in the valleys of death, and the nation with the strongest arm and thickest armor always went home with the fullest bag. In those days men armed to fight, not to prevent it. Our nation is known the world over as slow to wrath and only to arouse under great provocation. Every American is a volunteer counsellor of peace, but most of them clench their fists in their pockets while they advocate the adjustment of differences by persuasion.

Since Miltiades overcame the Asians at Marathon and the Germans threw their legions against the hosts of Caesar, no nation has presented the fighting man equal in valor and intelligence to that of the North American soldier. [Applause.] His record shows that he has overcome his adversary in 82 per cent of the battles in which he drew the trigger or crossed the sword. The glory of his own country is the consideration that leads him to arms, while the milk of the American mother has furnished him all the stimulation required. His own performance is his just biographer. The American people have pronounced their benedictions. His fame is fixed.

Have the nations honestly endeavored at any time to maintain peace except through the application of force? They have not. When man agrees to submit all his differences to an adjustment to be made by others he sinks in good part his identity. When a nation agrees that all its rights and all its wrongs shall be surrendered to the arbitrament of other nations, it loses its sovereignty, and what nation stands ready to confess its own impotency? Does not complete submission involve largely relinquishment of physical, intellectual, and moral strength? Is man ready for the sacrifice? If not, how can you expect more from the nation he creates and whose will is his will and subject to his subversion? Go to the history of all the nations and learn of their unsuccessful efforts to find the paths which lead to peace. They have hunted for them for three thousand years, while they blazed their course with the dagger and nailed their pointer boards to the end of their guns.

I believe universal peace can be secured without the use of shot and shell, but it can not be maintained unless it is followed by immediate and complete disarmament by every nation capable of bearing arms. When this hour arrives we will go to court for our redress and, waiting for the arrival of the aggressor until patience succumbs to old age, bequeath our grievance to our successor.

International arbitration is the only tribunal to which we can turn, and at its doors all nations should be persuaded to enter. While we parley, we will not fight; in the delay the races will benefit even although they may spend their time in rest and preparation. It is insisted by some opposed to international peace that pacification by persuasion is expensive; that men who won't fight become corrupt and only comply with decrees while standing on the auction block. Why should the cost of the trial influence the undertaking? It is said that it cost Caesar two millions when he risked the experiment of a generalship in Gaul. If Caesar had not crossed the Rubicon bearing the recollection of his many obligations in mind, what would his creditors have said of his disposition to do them justice?

While it is true that but few attempts have been made to bring about universal peace during the past century, history places to the credit of those who prefer conciliation to battle 434 instances wherein pacific adjustment of international disputes were secured. It is true that these settlements only involved principles applicable to international arbitration. Let the pacifier adopt such name as he may please, he is aiming in the right direction and has the approval of mankind.

Mr. Chairman, if all the nations agree to disarmament—and I hope my friend from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLOTT], who is so largely interested in the subject of international arbitration, will answer me this question, for I have hunted long to find a solution—when can they in safety to themselves disarm?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. What I have to say in reply to the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] can not be crowded into simply an answer to a question, but I will answer the question in this way as briefly as possible. I will say that nations can disarm and can have peace as soon as they agree to do so.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I am much obliged to my

friend for his answer; and for a reply to the gentleman, who is a man of sense, he knows as well as he knows the road from here to St. Louis, as well as he knows the valor of the people from whom he comes, that what he says is impossible. Where will be the force to execute the agreement to keep peace? Man does not always keep his agreements. Why should you expect more of his government? If a man can be relied upon to obey decrees and discharge his obligations, why not remove the disobedient and blow up the houses of detention? Why not abolish the time-honored sheriff and constable and forget the writs they serve and the processes they carry to enforce the judgments rendered against the unwilling? I will hope to show the gentleman his error before I have concluded.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit another interruption?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. We believe that the affairs of nations can be adjusted in exactly the same manner as the affairs of individuals. When the gentleman and myself have a difficulty, the law does not permit us to take the law into our own hands, but we are told to go to court.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. That is right.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. And we claim that nations can do exactly the same thing, and in fact should be held and compelled to do the same thing. In other words, what is law for the individuals should be law for the nation. That is our position, and we hold that when a nation compels a man to go to court that the government itself should first obey that mandate and should be controlled by the same law that it imposes upon its citizens.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, if I owe the gentleman, does he not think that I will respond? But suppose that I decline, how is he to obtain that which is his own? Would the gentleman appeal to a court for redress when it had not the power to enforce its decrees? Think it over and answer me. What kind of a civilization would we have if we should abolish the power to compel submission?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Would it be civilization to knock the gentleman's front teeth out?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Oh, my friend and I are 50 years old, and why do we parley in such dispute? While civilization recognizes the application of force and struggles to minimize it, nevertheless there are times when our teeth might have been knocked out if we had not had sufficient force to resist the attempt. My friend is dealing with man's wicked side, and to restrain him I am advocating what seems to me proper methods entirely within the rules of civilization.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The first rule of civilization is self-restraint.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The first international attempt to secure and maintain peace through the means of an international tribunal was made by the Amphictyonies more than five hundred years before Christ appeared with the consoling declaration in favor of peace upon earth with good will toward men. The independent tribes of Greece came together twice a year at a little town in the Pass of Thermopylae. At the temple of Delphi they assembled to reason with each other in the effort that peace might remain among them. It seems almost a travesty that within sight of the meeting place of these "dwellers around" Leonidas, the King of Sparta, subsequently confronted the hordes of Persia, and upon the very ground where these peacemakers had struggled with partial success to prevent their wars sleep the 400 and the 300 of their countrymen in whose memory there is erected the historical shaft on which there is the doleful inscription, "Go tell our countrymen that we lie here in obedience to their expressed command."

These promoters of peace bound themselves not to destroy any Amphictyonic towns nor turn away from them their running waters, either in time of war or time of peace, and to punish those who would violate this compact the Amphictyonies pledged themselves to employ their hands, feet, tongue, and their whole power to bring them to punishment. Even these semibarbaric strivers for peace encouraged war as an unavoidable means of settling disputes between two sides, not for destruction and devastation, but as a means of bringing the dispute to a conclusion.

In their decrees they taxed the lands of their enemies, to God enslaved their inhabitants, and made their lands an eternal waste and an everlasting wilderness. The decisions of the council were held sacred and inviolable and even arms were taken to enforce them. It is true that this great council seemed to have no organized means to enforce its decrees, yet it is shown in its history that it always had near at hand strong and active partisans who were ready and waiting to undertake the duty. This great council, the first peace effort known in

history, the object of which was to prevent strife, fell into the hands of Philip of Macedon, who turned it to his own selfish purpose, and finally used it to overthrow Sparta; Philip alleging as a reason that the Spartans themselves had become the victims of the tyranny and the cruelty of the Amphictyonies. It is interesting to note that while this council made not the policy of Greece, nor did it assume power to settle disputes, except among its members, it always had at its door hordes of men armed and trained to do the duty of enforcing its decrees.

All the designs for universal and international peace that have been submitted to the world from that time to this contain some provision by which its decrees can be enforced, or else the world refused to consider them.

This great association, composed of the twelve neighboring tribes, was as powerless to prevent bloodshed even among its own members as the wiser nations of this day seem to be. The historians dismiss their account of this great council as powerless for good, inasmuch as it lacked ability to execute its own decrees.

Two thousand years passed since the first effort for peace was made until the second one was tried at The Hague, in which our nation took so important and conspicuous part. I do not mean by this that treaties effecting peace and providing for its restoration and maintenance have not been made. I mean that the nations having friendly relations with each other have not assembled from that day to this (except in the instance related) for the purpose of establishing peace and then keeping it when established. Many plans have been suggested, but none of them have been considered worthy of notice by the nations, because their adoption involved a surrender of questions and traditions which the nations preferred to settle in their own way.

Henry the IV in 1603 proposed, by the elimination of envy and the removal of the balance of power, to maintain the peace of the whole of Europe. He planned to divide Europe evenly between a certain number of powers, and thus parceling to each power the same amount of territory no fear could be had of war because of the establishment of equality. The States he reduced to fifteen, each being required to subscribe to reciprocal pledges regarding religion and politics as well as the liberty of commerce.

The Amphictyonies furnished the model, and their policy was adopted with some modifications. Henry planned for a continual session of ministers, to whom were to be submitted all occasions for quarrels, with authority invested in the convention to pacify them.

Mr. Chairman, to execute the decrees of this great tribunal, what was proposed? Answer me the question when you reply to-morrow.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I can tell you now.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. While Henry's plan has been commended by some authorities, it involved the equal distribution of territory conquered from nations not included and the perpetual tax upon those who participated to maintain an armed force to execute the council's decrees.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. To-morrow, if the gentleman pleases, I can not stop now; look at the clock—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Just a moment. It might be a point you have not followed.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It is disconcerting, but I always yield to a friend.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Just one moment. In Sully's Mémoires this plan of Henry IV is described, and he says the plan was to annihilate Austria, and the other countries were to combine for that purpose, and these armies were to be parceled out to each one, and each one had to raise so much money—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I have read it—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But the whole plan fell through, because of the assassin's hand.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Such a scheme of pillage and plunder nowhere blackens the pages of history, and yet we are assured of its execution had not Providence interfered in behalf of its defenseless people by promptly removing Henry and placing him where his power of subjugation was broken by providential decree. There is authority for the statement that Elizabeth, the English Queen, had agreed to become a party to what was known as the "Christian Republic," and had consented that Henry, the King of France, should set the day, time, and place at which the means were to be devised for the invasion of Spain, and from each confederate was to be collected its share of cost incurred in the endeavor. All this in the effort to secure peace. The same application of brute force to obtain peace that has followed civilization since its dawn. This proposition of King

Henry can not be taken as the initiative of our present programme for peace, as it did not include the benefits to be derived from international arbitration.

This plan of the French King suggested to William Penn, the apostle of peace, a scheme in which Penn himself said that he desired "first to show the desirableness of peace and that the truest means of it were justice, not war." In Penn's design he provided "that before this sovereign assembly should be brought all differences depending between one sovereign and another that can not be adjusted by diplomatic means before its sessions begin." This is a most perfect conception of the object to be reached and would have accomplished the author's intentions had all nations agreed thereto and after agreement kept the faith. But the great author, doubting the effectiveness of his own tribunal, made a further provision:

That if any of the sovereigns constituting this imperial diet should refuse to submit their claims or pretensions to the diet, or to accept its judgment, and should seek their remedy by arms, or delay compliance beyond the time specified, all the other sovereigns, uniting their forces, should compel submission to and performance of the sentence and payment of all costs and damages.

In his comment on this provision he concludes that an acceptance of the compact would of itself deprive the sovereign of power and could not show the will to dispute the conclusion; consequently peace would be procured. It is but just to the author of this great document that he does not recommend disarmament. It is also just to him to conclude that he anticipated such result would follow the execution of the compact. No man understood the frailties of human nature better than Penn, so he suggested the first assembly should be central and that "to avoid quarrel for precedence the room may be round and have several doors to come in and go out at." Thus it is plain that while he was striving to increase "personal friendship between powers and states," he was at the same time doubtful of his ability to maintain peace even while the delegates were preparing for it.

I believe there is no man known to history who so greatly desired peace as did this convert to the religion of George Fox, of whom he was a compatriot and at the same time beloved follower; yet he doubted the success of his own design for the reasons found in the statement which he appended to it:

That the strongest and richest sovereignty will never agree to it, and if it should, there would be danger of corruption more than of force one time or other; that it will endanger an effeminacy by such a disuse of the trade of soldiery; that if there should be any need for it, upon any occasion, we should be at a loss as they were in Holland in 1672; that there will be great want of employment for younger brothers of families, and that the poor of that time must either turn soldiers or thieves; that sovereign princes and states will hereby become not sovereign—a thing they will never endure.

William Penn's "peaceable expedient" was approved by his own people in religion, but failed to receive the notice of those who prefer personal property to personal friendship, real estate to real love. "Those who would not prefer Jerusalem above their chief joy" were in the great majority and were in no wise influenced by Penn's expressed distrust in his own scheme.

This great counsellor, whose word and deed were always consistent, concluded his well-meaning and sensible advice with the admonition that—

By the same rules of justice and prudence by which parents and masters govern their families and magistrates their cities and estates and their republics and princes and kings their principalities and kingdoms, Europe may obtain and preserve peace among her sovereignties.

Penn admits that his "expedient" was but the modified design of Henry IV, as this great prince conceded to the Greeks the origin of the proposal which he submitted, a trial of which the red hand of Ravallac alone prevented. From the days of these two peacemakers to the present no less than forty-four different schemes have been proposed, but none of them accepted with a seriousness productive of results. In none is disarmament provided for except in the substitution of an international force with which to compel obedience to the council's decrees.

The combined wisdom of all the attempts may be summed up in the words of Sprague, who says:

It will only be expedient to state now that any tribunal which has not an accessory physical power sufficient to procure the execution of its decrees must be essentially a tribunal of arbitration, no matter what it may be denominated.

The unanswerable question comes to the human mind, Where will be a corresponding power to restrain the one provided for in Sprague's scheme? The author does not offer a solution because his reason ends at this stage.

Arbitration, to be effective, must assume to settle all disputes. A little can be gained by delay, although we may reason one week and fight the next week. Every hour of peace furnishes so much to the betterment of the races and minimizes the horrors of war and renders them less frequent. We can't settle all differences by means of arbitration, for the one reason that all the nations insist that all disputes affecting their autonomy or

their independence shall be excepted. The power of different states to give each to itself its own law will always remain in the state. Nearly all our wars have been fought to obtain independence of government. No patriot will consent to the sacrifice which such a surrender involves.

The result obtained through The Hague conference, in my judgment, indicates the beginning of a new epoch in the history of nations. Here were assembled the representatives of twenty-six governments, comprising one thousand six hundred millions of people and whose dominions and dependencies cover nine-tenths of the planet. The outcome was good because it was in the direction of good. But what was accomplished by this great tribunal looking toward the world's disarmament?

"On the question of armaments, agreement between the powers was, as had been anticipated, plainly out of the question; the difficulties were unsurmountable and national distrust too deep." The conference declared "that the limitation of military burdens is greatly to be desired for the increase of the material and moral well-being of humanity;" and it resolved "that the governments, taking into consideration the proposals made at the conference, should study the possibility of an agreement concerning the limitation of military and naval forces and of war budgets." This proposal is said to be a sufficient endorsement of the Czar's appeal for universal peace.

It will not impose a great burden upon the memory of man to recall the fact that Great Britain, Russia, and Japan earnestly indorsed this proposal. On the question of armaments three declarations were made and three agreements reached, forbidding the throwing of projectiles from balloons, the use of those only intended to diffuse asphyxiating gases, and the employment of expansive bullets.

The commentator on the results secured by this conference of nations says that while "something has thus been done in the way of mitigating the horrors of war in the future, but the regulations, however admirable, appear somewhat inconsistent." I believe that the world has concluded that the only real advantage obtained through this conference was to minimize the horrors attending war.

Can it be expected that any one of the nations participating in this conference should proceed to the arrest of its armaments when all the other nations are contributing to increase them? No one can dispute the fact that the existence of a permanent court of arbitration invites the settlement of disputes by argument. Arbitration, however, will never be completely successful until it can be made obligatory. This, of course, is impossible until all the nations conclude to forfeit their autonomy.

The peacemakers representing our Government were unwilling to affix their names to the conclusions reached by The Hague conference until this amendment was added to them:

Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not entering upon, interfering with, or entangling itself in the political questions or internal administration of any foreign state. Nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to require a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

Thus our nation agreed that while all the other nations might arbitrate, if they saw fit, any question they pleased, we would reserve to ourselves the right to settle all which might be adjudged purely American. This was right. But who are to determine whether the question raised is purely American? The tribunal was silent when this amendment was made, and its record shows an immediate and final adjournment. Thus our autonomy was reserved, and universal and permanent peace postponed.

Peace the whole world over can not be maintained without armaments, because the world does not contain the same people with the same speech, with the same views upon the same subjects, entirely different in race, dissimilar in appearance, and with differing ideas of civilization.

The Amphictyonies spoke the same tongue, and those who would feel themselves strangers because they were not united by a peculiar tie were not invited and were not expected at their councils.

The first attempt of different races was made at The Hague, and civilization looks to this tribunal alone not for the establishment of universal peace, not in the expectation that through conference nature will be changed, but for the remedy that will result not in complete disarmament, but in its great reduction.

This is all that can in reason be expected, the beginning of which, regretfully to be said, nowhere appears.

Since the day when Henry the IV proposed to relieve the miseries of the European races by enforcing with arms the remedies proposed in his "grand design," European nations have spent almost two-thirds of their time in actual war.

During those three centuries the wars among the nations have

decreased in number, while many of their attending barbarities have been eliminated. History stands for this statement.

If the advance of the British and the Egyptians upon Khar-toum, covering a period of three years, can be included, Great Britain, with her millions uncounted and her soldiers and sailors standing constantly at "attention," has ninety-five years of war to her credit during this period. Yet it would be well to remember that since the Crimea to this time this nation has fought but two years, and they were spent in the absorption of the South African Republic. Has Great Britain become the leading advocate of peace or has her great armament, constantly increasing until it is twice that of any other two nations, put the balance of the world in fear of her? Does her complete preparation keep her from harm? Her statesmen contend for this conclusion. The annals seem to justify it. Do the great guns on her sixty-one first-class battle ships and her thirty-nine armored cruisers supply the influence her diplomats and her pacifiers fail to command? Has the knowledge that her battle line exceeds that of France more than twice over and of the United States and Germany each three times over promoted the peace of the world during the past twenty-five years? Great Britain is making the experiment of arming to maintain peace. The world watches it with anxiety.

Since the French laid the siege which resulted in the capture of La Rochelle, nearly three hundred years ago, France has spent one hundred and four years of her time in enforcing her views upon others through the lights made by the blazing gun.

Spain, since the days of the archdukes, kept at the throat of what she called her enemies sixty years, between 1624 and 1783, and the question might be in kindness asked, What has been the advantage to either France or Spain in property or person for their struggles in behalf of national rights?

Yet no man who has the power of reflection would contend that all these wars could have been averted without the loss of honor which patriotism would not approve and human nature tolerate.

Since Russia made her war against the Tartars, 1686, and a few years later conquered Azor, which marks her entrance into the politics of southeastern Europe, she has had but forty-six years of war.

Since the Sultan invaded Hungary in 1526 and later fled from Vienna, Turkey has been engaged in war one hundred and three years, and yet civilization seems to make no demand upon Turkey for more than an occasional expression of good will toward others.

Since the day when John George, the elector of Saxony, obstinately refused to break his neutrality and thereby assist in the dismemberment of the Empire and later surrendered to the persuasion of Gustavus Adolphus and allied himself against it, Sweden has enjoyed the absence of external discord three hundred years, except in long intervals when she has been compelled to fight. During these three hundred years she is credited with but sixteen years of war.

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. If the gentleman will yield to me, I simply desire to call his attention to the fact that for thirty-five years there has been no great European war. It is true that Spain had her bloody encounter in America, England in Africa, and Russia in Asia, but during these many years there has not been a European war between two great nations, and the writers on this subject have reached the conclusion that the great powers of Europe are really afraid to-day to set the machinery of war in motion, and to wage the war for which they have been preparing for so long a time.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Prussia accepted France, Bavaria, and Spain as allies and made the Silesian war in 1740. From that time until her coalition she fought only sixteen years. It can be said to the honor of Austria since she made her peace with Russia at Dresden, 1745, she has been engaged in war but sixteen years. This is an account of the wars among the different nations named herein and does not include the campaigns which they may have made against their own people.

The history of these nations during the period which I have so quickly covered shows that the grand design of Henry IV made no impression upon them which lasted longer than the short hour consumed in reading it. They turned a deaf ear to the projects of Crucé, who prayed that they might be read by the kings of the whole world and designated truth as their escort. They denied the learning of Ernest Landgrave, who had commanded the united armies of Germany and smote his religious ideas with the arguments of maniacs. With defiant shouts they trampled upon the scheme of William Penn and laughed in the face of John Bellers, who proposed a general council to which all religious persuasions might go, not for dispute, but settlement. They snubbed the "elaboration" of St. Pierre, who

asked them to subscribe to the agreement that any sovereign who should take up arms against another member of the great "Peace Society" should be considered its enemy. These fighting monarchs threw the extracts of Rousseau and Puffendorf in their camp fires, and after smearing the essay of Grotius with the blood of their offenders, hoisted it upon their pikes and carried it from the Dardanelles to Culloeden field, terrifying peace until she fled from the whole of Europe not to return until she discovered that constant war meant annihilation through the increased armaments which the nations' discord demanded.

For Europe was seldom at rest in those days. Her history compels her to confess to seventy-seven years of war during the seventeenth century. The eighteenth shows a better record, for she spent but sixty-five years of it on the battlefield. The nineteenth shows the effect of pacification upon the militant spirit of the European, for he spent fifty-three years of it in peace and fought but forty-seven. To our encouragement we must bear in mind that the nations of Europe engaged in war but fourteen years between 1850 and 1875, and only nine years between 1875 and 1900.

Has the spirit of man been broken, or does he walk in humility with his ambition delivered up and his lust repressed? No; he is fast learning that war means destruction of his fortune. Its damage to the morals of those who engage in it the nations have not made prominent, but the effect on their budgets is receiving their most earnest and attentive consideration. Nations moan under the load of great armies and fast multiplying fleets, yet they are afraid to reduce them. Let them continue to add to their burdens until they conclude it to be cheaper to talk than fight, then they will consent to shift their accounts so that they may balance. A battle between two great nations costs ten times as much in money as it did a hundred years ago, and will cost more as man's adroitness is employed in working out contrivances to destroy whole armies in one day to march in triumph to the disputed territory in the next.

Great mobilization tends to confine war to selected spots. Pointed instances are fresh in our minds. Belligerents rarely listen to advice. They are quite ready to obey the command of those enabled to enforce it. If war must be, let us limit the conflagration to boundaries in which the interests of others are not found. If our armaments bring us to no other good than this, we will find our money well spent.

What has been our record since the dedication of America's sacred honor, her lives, and her property to the cause of liberty? Beginning with this declaration, our wars, including those with the Indians, cover a period of sixty-two years; excluding those engaged with the Indians, twenty-five years.

They are: 1775, the war of independence; 1776, Cherokees attack the settlements in eastern Tennessee and North Carolina; 1778, massacre at Wyoming, in Pennsylvania; 1779, expedition of General Sullivan against the Iroquois; 1798, war with France; 1790, Indian war; Harmar defeated 1790, St. Clair 1791, and Wayne victorious 1794; 1802, war with Tripoli; 1803, Navajos in hostility to the whites; 1811, war incited by Tecumseh; 1812, second war with Great Britain; 1812, Winnebago and Dakotas take sides with the English in the war against the United States; 1813, Creek war; 1817, border warfare of the Seminoles; 1832, Black Hawk war; 1835, Seminole war; 1846, war with Mexico; 1848, trouble with Oregon Indians; 1855, Rogue River war; 1861, the civil war; 1862, Sioux rebellion; 1862, Apache outbreak; 1865, outbreak of Shoshones; 1872, Apache outbreak; 1873, Modoc war; 1876, Sioux rebellion; 1879, war with the Utes; 1890, Dakota rebellion; 1898, war with Spain; 1899, Philippine insurrection; 1900, Chinese expedition.

It is true the professional campaigner does not include the Indian wars in our actual fighting time, and to escape the terrible record of strife we have made he waves his hand and replies: "You can't count Indian killing as war." If the Indian wrote our history the inference is safe that he would give his instances of battlefield struggle the name of war.

The minutes kept by the time marker show us to have been quarrelsome—ready to settle, equally ready to fight. This part of our history some Americans wish to defend and explain, but our victories every one of us applauds. It is true we are under the restraint which our foremost place in the civilized rank imposes upon us, but our willingness to submit our disputes and surrender our traditions will not entitle us to the first reward when the arbitration day arrives and our ships drop their armaments into the sea at the command of the "Great Council."

Who is there among us to condemn the American delegates to The Hague conference because they refused to subscribe to the final act until an amendment was added thereto reserving to us the right to settle in our own way all purely American ques-

tions? This position was right, of course, but lacked the degree of submission necessary to secure universal peace.

Oppenheim, in a treatise published last year, sums up the effect which The Hague conference had upon the world's peace:

Soon after The Hague peace conference, in October, 1899, war broke out in South Africa between Great Britain and the two Boer Republics, which leads to the latter's annexation at the end of 1901. The assassination of the German ambassador and the general attack on the European legations in Peking in 1900 led to a united action of the powers against China for the purpose of vindicating this violation of the fundamental rules of the law of nations. In December, 1902, Great Britain, Germany, and Italy instituted a blockade against the coast of Venezuela for the purpose of making her comply with their demands for indemnification of their subjects wronged during civil wars in Venezuela, and the latter consents to pay indemnities, to be settled by a mixed commission of diplomats. But as other powers than those who had instituted the blockade likewise claim indemnities, the matter is referred to the permanent court of arbitration at The Hague, which in 1904 gives it verdict in favor of the blockading powers. In February of 1904 war breaks out in the Far East between Russia and Japan on account of Manchuria and Korea.

While the results have not been positive, our first attempt has proven its worthiness in that it will inspire repetition.

The past ten years show the "curse" to be still with us, yet we have confined it to isolated sections of the world. Russia and Japan refused to reconcile, but they consented to confine their battles to the fields of Manchuria upon the urgent request of the nations having sufficient guns to compel a compliance. Did the guns influence the seclusion? The nations who had them entertain that opinion.

I believe the great armaments and the fear which the nations possessing them have of each other have secured us, at least, a partial "armed peace." Persuasion has proven a failure. A few appealed for peace. Meanwhile the multitude appeals to arms.

How did a trial of Emerson's love, as a state basis, address itself to our sisters of South America? They were once tempted to agree to arbitration, but the effort to develop the "love basis" was not accepted with a seriousness that shows perfect appreciation. A plan of a permanent tribunal of arbitration was adopted by the International American Conference April 18, 1890, and the signatures of eleven States were obtained—Bolivia, Ecuador, Haiti, Honduras, Nicaragua, Salvador, the United States of America, the United States of Brazil, the United States of Venezuela, and Uruguay.

The treaty proposed lapsed, but the following Governments, in consequence of a form of extension submitted October 28, 1891, signified their acceptance of the proposal to revive the lapsed treaty: Ecuador, Guatemala, Honduras, Venezuela, Nicaragua, Salvador, and Bolivia; but the matter never progressed beyond this stage. Ecuador was in the throes of a rebellion in 1895; in 1893-94 Honduras and Nicaragua were at war; and in Honduras in the last three decades military revolts have been constant; the circumstances leading to the blockading of the ports of Venezuela and the dissensions that have beset that country are well known; an outbreak in Granada in 1891 led to a general insurrection in Nicaragua in 1892, and since 1897 there have been revolts at Nargote, San Juan del Sur, Rivas, and elsewhere; all this in addition to the war against Honduras; a military revolt occurred in Salvador in 1898, and other risings attended with bloodshed have occurred in that Republic; Bolivia was the seat of disturbances in 1899.

Our Government was one of the signatories, but did not sign the treaty. The reason for its failure is not plain, and perhaps had better be misunderstood. I hope that the history of our country written by strangers will not slander us and assign as a reason that we concluded it would cost our Government less time and money to fight than mediate.

These countries proposed that all controversies which did not imperil their independence should be submitted to arbitration. No other was excepted. Would our subscription to obligatory arbitration, in which all our differences should be settled, shake the opinion of the other great powers in our ability to provide for ourselves in our own way? Why did we not agree with our neighbors who had no armament, neither had they money with which to buy it? We had both. Was it worth while for us to surrender a principle we had secured with force in order that we might avoid further conflict? We need not look for such submission until we are ready to confess our own weakness of purse and forsake the policy of armed resistance.

The great powers, as well as the small, have made several unsuccessful attempts to preserve peace through means of arbitration. The outcome was not entirely without hope. The first modern arbitration treaty was that between the United States and Great Britain of November 19, 1794, which instituted three arbitrations. In 1812 the United States and Great Britain made war. The United States and Spain signed treaties involving arbitrations October 27, 1795; August 11, 1802; June 16,

1870; February 12, 1871, and February 28, 1885, and made war in 1898.

Austria, France, Great Britain, and Russia were the signatories to an arbitration treaty of November 20, 1815, and France and Russia, by an additional article to the treaty of peace of May 30, 1814, instituted a special arbitral commission for certain named purposes. The Crimean war occurred in 1853-1856, the Austro-Prussian war in 1866, and the Franco-Prussian war in 1870-71. France and Mexico signed a treaty involving an arbitration March 9, 1839, and made war in 1861-1867. The United States and Mexico signed an arbitration treaty April 11, 1839, and made war in 1846-1848. Chile and Peru signed treaties of arbitration September 27, 1871, and made war in 1879. Bolivia and Chile signed, December 5, 1872, a treaty providing an arbitration, and made war in 1879. Colombia and Venezuela signed a treaty of arbitration September 14, 1881. In 1899 Colombia had to deal with an insurrection which is declared to have been aided from Venezuela.

I am satisfied that we have but started on the way toward that condition of amity which forms perfect society and would form perfect international relationship. I am also satisfied that man is yet much nearer the animal than the angel, with the attractions of the former so great that his advancement toward the latter is seriously impeded. Is all this an excuse for militarism? No; but it offers a reason.

We are safe in the deduction that during the past three hundred years history shows that the voice of the peacemaker has been drowned in the din of battle. A comparison of the present time with the past forces upon us the lamentable conclusion that we have made but little progress toward general peace that is not secured through armaments.

While we have escaped from the age of fable, we have not reached that degree of human completeness that will enable us to maintain universal peace and at the same time preserve our own sovereignties. These sovereignties have always been protected by arms and not by love. When will we reach a condition of nature where we may in safety completely disarm?

With sin came selfishness. To restrain men from their selfish purposes civil government was established. To inform the well disposed and to constrain those who would do evil, laws are made and above all are enforced when made. No height of civilization seems to bring with it absolute obedience. Many are willing, many are unwilling; to the latter force must be applied to obtain submission. When will we lay down arms?

When the soul of man gives up its covetousness and hastens to hide its avarice; when the itching palm is supplanted by the one that is stretched forth in its fullness; when the merchant rushes to the market place to give, not to sell; when the whirl of the bullet is exchanged for the anthems of praise; when the "sword of the spirit" redeems the one that wounds the flesh—then, and not till then, can each nation lay down its arms and enjoy the peace secured through love; then will the races have reached the state where the soldier will abandon the parapet to prostrate himself at the altar. The sailor will strike his colors for the last time, donate his ship to the plutocrat in which to sail the world over, distributing his wealth equally among the unfortunate, and the 12-inch gun will be converted into sewer pipe through which the moral filth of ten thousand years' accumulation will be carried from our sight. The farmer will yoke himself with his ox to relieve the burden of the latter, while the trader and changer will pile their goods in the roads for the enjoyment of all their neighbors. Then will memory be preferred to inheritance and man shall, as Pitt did, marry only his country. Then will some of the Ten Commandments become obsolete, for the desire to steal and to kill will have departed from man's soul and his neighbor's ass will be no longer the subject of his covetousness. Then we will disarm and exchange the cannoner for the priest, the flag for the cloth, for the fangs will be drawn from the serpent; but we will never consent, until we see the fangs of the other serpents safe in the lap of love, that America should become her own dentist. The possibility of such a condition would be a nightmare to civilization. In such a state the ambition of men would die within them, and they would walk the world over without aim and without spirit. The suggestion bears upon its face its own absurdity; yet men would not then fight.

When I came to this House ten years ago my coming was unheralded, and when I go my going will be unnoticed. While my stay here has been without great profit to my country and my constituency, it has afforded me the chance of hearing from the same lips appeals for conversion and votes for war. When I asked for an assignment to the Committee on Naval Affairs, it was with an avowed purpose of using a determination to prevent a further increase of the American Navy. Within a year

from the time my membership began the present Speaker of the House reported a resolution from his committee providing "for the national defense and for every purpose connected therewith, and to be expended at the discretion of the President, to remain available until January 1, 1899, \$50,000,000." On this resolution the yeas were 313 and the nays were none, immediately followed by loud applause. I had joined the majority. Preceding the adoption of this resolution, many patriotic speeches were made, all encouraging war upon a nation loaded with debt and from which its former glory had all departed. Not one word in favor of peace. The people's representatives wanted a fight.

Monday, April 11, 1898, the President of the United States sent a message to Congress, from which I have extracted the following:

And in the interest of humanity and to aid in preserving the lives of the starving people of the island, I recommend that the distribution of food and supplies be continued, and that an appropriation be made out of the Public Treasury to supplement the charity of our citizens.

The issue is now with Congress. It is a solemn responsibility. I have exhausted every effort to relieve the intolerable condition of affairs which is at our doors. Prepared to execute every obligation imposed upon me by the Constitution and the law, I await your action.

God bless the name of William McKinley, and may posterity read of him as we knew him, and appreciate his effort to prevent the spilling of human blood that the American people demanded he should spill.

Nearly every American wanted a fight. Congress had not the power to resist had it been inclined, and had it not been for the determination of the intellectual and physical giant who presided over the House, those of you who were here at that time know, we would have made the mistake of beginning the fight before we had the gun loaded. The most pronounced advocates of peace explained as their reason for wanting a fight that humanity might be relieved. While the combination of peace-war people claimed that our honor was at stake, the everyday American of passion and muscle wanted a fight because we had been insulted.

Remember all this occurred but eight years ago. Are we better restrained now than then? Monday, April 25, this House passed these two resolutions unanimously:

First. That war be, and the same is hereby, declared to exist, and that war has existed since the 21st day of April, A. D. 1898, including said day, between the United States and the Kingdom of Spain.

Second. Resolved that the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, to call into the actual service of the United States the military of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry this act into effect.

The work was done. America had gone forth not for conquest, but relief. She has become a world power, and her armaments must be increased to enable her to properly keep her place.

The RECORD has no reference to any Member raising his voice in opposition to this declaration of war against a nation that had withered and decayed with only a recollection of her former greatness to sustain her. Young Americans, for the first time in our history, volunteered to cross the seas and fight the battles of their native land, while their parents took to their knees and prayed the Master to deliver their sons from the hands of men who could not fight and did not want to fight. I have only words of praise for those who made our battle, and no criticism for those who encouraged them, for the cause justified us, as subsequent events have proven. I am begging for the patience of those who, insisting upon this war, now show irritation, not over its victories, but with its consequent calamities and unavoidable results.

We would not have fought the Spanish-American war had we been fully and thoroughly prepared. Three more great battle ships on this coast where the Spanish could have seen them, and they would have kept their thin-skinned ships at home and we would have our graveyards yet to fill and our money yet to spend.

Then the Spaniard became obstinate and would not surrender his sovereignty over the Philippines until we paid him \$20,000,000. The law of humanity as well as the law of nations required us to retain the islands and take up a great duty in a land of blinding sunshine by day and terrifying darkness by night. Dewey obeyed instructions from his Government when he destroyed the only power which Spain possessed to maintain peace in the Philippines. We were bound under the laws prevailing among the nations to supply it. Congress was asked for \$20,000,000 to carry out the treaty of obligations between the United States and Spain. Who was deceived as to the purpose for which this money was to be used? No Member of this House who sat in it on the 20th day of February, 1899, was misled. He was forewarned by Mr.

Dockery, who offered his defective amendment defining our policy toward the Philippine Islands and declaring it to be our intention not to incorporate their inhabitants with United States citizenship. For this appropriation 219 gentlemen voted, while but 33 are recorded in the negative. The wisdom of this Congressional act has been submitted to the source of power, the American people, and has their approval. I was among those who voted for this appropriation with full knowledge of its consequences and stand ready to accept my unimportant share of the responsibility.

The Philippines offer but few inducements to the pilgrim or the plowman; but oh, what a field for a conqueror. Does the fear of an undiscovered would-be conqueror furnish an excuse for urging great armaments? No; but it presents a reason. Our ownership of his sovereignty constitutes us his protector and puts upon us the burden of bearing arms in his defense. The duty to feed and educate the Filipino carries with it the corresponding duty of protection to his home and his property, whether his rights are invaded from within or without.

I believe it to be the common understanding of all Americans that the Filipino should have the sovereignty of his islands at such time that he may be able to satisfy them of his capabilities to manage well for himself. When that time will arrive no one now living can with even reasonable certainty prophesy. I believe the people now born will have secured their passports to immortality before the Filipino will have satisfied the American people that he has sufficiently matured to stand alone. The standard which he must approach to secure his independence of us no man can with accuracy describe. While none of us expect him to Americanize, he must certainly learn to live in a social community where respect for household ties is observed before he will have reached a measure of domestication that will receive American commendation. Since the time when Christopher Columbus offered the new world to Henry VII, in their views upon the domestic relation it has been the proud boast of every American that his countrymen were in the right. Our views upon the method of civilization may have made much discord, creating new methods and offering new ideas, but upon the immutability of the nuptial tie we have always agreed.

When will the Filipino learn that obedience is the first step to self-government? Until he manifests a resignation to the law of his own land, whether made by Americans or his own people, and we are satisfied of his sincerity, his destiny is in our hands.

Whether the possession of these islands by our Government is important to us in the eastern equation should have no weight with us in the final settlement which we may make with the Filipino. We did not embrace the occasion to extend our empire; we should not consider the Filipino's wealth when the day of his independence is at hand. We can afford generosity, but never meanness. That there was an imperative reason for the acquisition of these islands is apparent in the purchase of what we had already taken by conquest. They came to us in the entirety, and when they go from us they shall be undivided. The most desolate and empty portion of the islands, along with their unopened mines of wealth, is equally entitled to our defense; not one small acre of them will be disposed of to another nation without its owner's consent.

Until the hour of his preparation is reached, when he can stand unsupported or when he can with intelligence decide between us and another, we must bear the burden of his defense and further embellish our great name by bearing it without complaint. We must not forget that we compacted by treaty with Spain, December 10, 1898, when she relinquished her sovereignty to us, to secure all the inhabitants of these islands in the free exercise of their religion and guaranteeing to all Spanish subjects therein their rights of property and the uninterrupted opportunity of carrying on such industry, commerce, or profession in which they might be at that time engaged. Shall we run from our obligations and designate another keeper to whom these defenseless people might object? Spain was satisfied with our offer of guardianship. We will not surrender it willingly or unwillingly until our dependents assent.

The example of our civilization shall be set at all times before the Filipino in the hope that barbarous conditions may disappear. The process must be slow, the American patience abundant. Has the conqueror appeared? He has not; but we intend to indefinitely delay his appearance by the conservation of our great and admittedly capable armaments. Does the proper defense of these islands furnish an excuse for our armaments?

No; but it presents a good reason. We offer lands and possessions for protection. We have traditions which neither

the fear of the sword nor the proffer of gold nor the prayers of the weak will tempt us to abandon. Questions, purely American, reserved to our own keeping for our own settlement, according to our own conceptions, over which we deny the right of suggestion from others. By our armaments alone are they secured to us, not in battle, but in its postponement.

Since the father of our race, when Abraham was bidden to go to the south and was promised to be made a ruler of the land in which he might be a stranger, the human family has wandered. The Americans grow tired of looking around upon the same sameness and stray away into the recesses of forests after riches and pleasure. When they are imprisoned through the humor of a despot or held for ransom by a bandit what have we to depend upon to extend the American breastwork of influence but our sailor man in blue, with his white squadron? High-mettled fellows, with hearts of oak, they are ready to obey with or without weapons; they don't beg for protection for themselves, but for their Government, whose majesty is so cheerfully committed to them. The crossbow, the sling, the catapult, and the battering-ram will not repress the desire of him who would prevail over us. A longer-range gun than that of him whose appetite would tempt him to approach will maintain the distance between him and the object he would devour. Who is to determine the weight and extent of our armaments? The Congress. Who is to advise the Congress? Those in whose skill and attainments the Congress has confidence.

For reasons already made known to you we have been compelled to reduce the estimates submitted for our naval defense, but we have done it with great care and with a view of adding to its strength rather than adding to its size. We have reported to you only those reinforcements which our great naval experts insist are absolutely necessary to increase efficiency and maintain preparation. We should continue to arm that battles may be delayed. The fear of awful slaughter and the enormous cost attending hostile attack, with the uncertainty of results, will encourage unwillingness and prolong discussion. Make war expensive and man's selfishness will avert it rather than provoke it. All other remedies have failed. The races have concluded to employ this one.

Great Britain settled by arbitration 124 international disputes in which she was interested during the past fifty years; she had but two years of international war during the same period. While her arguments persuaded, the knowledge of her guns furnished the food for reflection. The policy of our Government is fixed, and we must not willingly set aside the influence which we should exert in coming conferences to settle the equality of national defense. That influence will be overpowering if our arms are kept brightened. It will be lost if they are decreased in numbers and capability.

When the people grow tired of the burdens which great armaments entail, their militant spirit will surrender to their cupidity, and, groaning under the fear of bankruptcy, they will demand the reduction of armaments through the mediation of international tribunals. When that great day comes we will rise to the supreme task which civilization imposes upon us and lead in the movement to diminish, but not debilitate. The weight of our word will be measured by the weight of our armaments.

Our only hope for this result lies through international agreement. Let us keep the hope constantly within us and apply ourselves diligently to this end. If the nations should engage in war and destroy every battle ship afloat, they would immediately proceed to supply them with others. Russia now presents this example. Then why fight to be rid of our armaments? Don't let us strive to wholly disarm by force or persuasion, but to reduce. No well-prepared nation can be expected to set the example, but the time can not be far in advance when they will all take the initiative. International wars will not be contemplated, but compromise expected. Each nation will retain sufficient armed force for the suppression of disorder, the maintenance of its independence, the protection of its own people and property, the enforcement of its own decrees, the settlement of its own questions, and the defense of its own traditions. All questions arising between nations will likely go to court for adjustment because of the absence of preparation for international war. The ideal state will be reached. Compulsory international arbitration is a dream, and involves complete disarmament. It is not looked for, and should not be hoped for. Man is not ready for submission that deprives him of his independence and his state of its sovereignty.

Don't let our modesty tend to an underestimation of our own importance, and don't let our official acts interrupt the humanizing influence which our nation sows broadcast throughout

the world. Don't let us fritter away our opportunities in reviving theories that have proven failures. Every place where our national influence reaches quickens with life and blossoms with prosperity. Let us give our Government the armament she desires for the work she has to do, and make laws of sense which even the madman of the earth will be bound to observe. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER].

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to the addresses of the distinguished gentlemen from Ohio and from Pennsylvania and subscribe heartily to the views expressed by the peace-loving Quaker from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, history informs us that during the Administration of President Monroe the people of this country were generally prosperous and contented, and we have always been pleased to refer to that time as the era of good feeling. In some degree this might be compared to the accession of President McKinley to the Presidency on March 4, 1897. The country had passed through four years of severe business depression to awaken with new hope after the result of the elections of 1896 became known.

I do not propose to enter into a discussion of the causes of this revival. We on this side of the Chamber attribute it largely to the protective tariff system, while the gentlemen on the other side contend it is the result of the great discoveries of gold and the general development of the country. The facts are that during the past nine years we have made greater strides in every phase of human existence than any other country on the face of this globe in double that period. In 1896 we were classed as the most influential nation on the North American continent; to-day we are the dominating influence in the Western Hemisphere and in the very first rank of the nations of the world, excelling all of them in our institutions of learning and our agricultural products and competing successfully in all of the markets of the world in every branch of manufacture. We are indeed a great nation.

During the past nine years we have acquired vast territory—in the West Indies, the Pacific Ocean, and in the Orient—so that to-day it may almost be said that the sun never sets on our domain. All of this has brought us new and greater responsibilities, and we are compelled, as a guaranty to the peace of the world, to make this country a great naval power.

Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is, in my judgment, of greater importance to the people of this country than any other measure we will be called upon to consider at this session.

Here on the floor of this House protests have been made against the expenditure of large sums of money for our naval establishment. I, for one, as long as I remain a Member of this House, will vote and use my influence for the building of a navy equal to that of Great Britain; this, as I have already said, would guarantee a lasting peace between this and the countries of the earth.

Mr. Chairman, I submit the following tables, showing the relative naval standing of the leading nations in the years 1880, 1890, 1900, and 1905:

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE,
April 27, 1906.

Sea strength of the principal naval powers, 1880.

Class.	Great Britain.		France.		Russia.		Germany.	
	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.
Armored vessels	48	306,410	41	214,937	31	94,112	23	95,917
Unarmored vessels	75	132,954	67	103,424	40	49,192	24	45,102
Total	123	439,364	108	318,361	71	143,272	47	141,019

Class.	Italy.		United States.		Spain.		Japan.	
	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.	No.	Tonnage.
Armored vessels	13	67,913	14	27,600	7	32,165	5	10,877
Unarmored vessels	12	16,754	26	54,528	29	43,337	3	2,313
Total	25	84,667	40	82,128	36	75,502	8	13,190

Rank of principal naval powers.

Great Britain first, France second, Russia third, Germany fourth, Italy fifth, United States sixth, Spain seventh, Japan eighth. At this date all nations were building torpedo boats, but few were completed.

See strength of the principal naval powers, 1890.

Class.	Great Britain.		France.		Russia.		Italy.		Germany.		United States.		Spain.		Austria.		Japan.	
	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.	No.	Ton-nage.
Armored.....	72	507,490	59	348,490	40	167,122	19	143,121	26	105,721	21	48,663	7	38,683	15	65,800	6	12,437
Unarmored.....	182	290,269	112	161,229	57	74,628	35	55,417	42	77,396	33	73,706	43	69,921	29	40,008	21	34,191
Torpedo boat.....	86	4,965	125	6,100	119	4,520	60	5,000	60	5,000	1	100	14	1,464	81	2,100	20	300
Total.....	340	802,714	296	515,819	216	246,270	114	203,538	128	188,117	55	122,469	64	110,068	75	107,908	47	46,928

Rank of principal naval powers: Great Britain first, France second, Russia third, Italy fourth, Germany fifth, United States sixth, Spain seventh, Austria eighth, Japan ninth.

Sea strength of the principal naval powers, 1900.

Type.	Great Britain.				France.				United States.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class (above 9,000 tons).....	45	562,470	11	154,900	19	197,920	1	12,530	9	99,830	6	78,000
Battle ships, second class, and coast-defense iron-clads (below 9,000 tons).....	25	142,355	—	—	25	123,725	—	—	8	35,090	4	11,020
Armored cruisers.....	11	71,260	14	167,600	10	63,050	11	104,000	2	17,415	6	76,500
Cruisers, protected and unprotected, not armored (above 3,000 tons).....	77	446,490	—	—	22	105,495	2	7,860	18	86,500	9	43,200
Cruisers, 1,000 to 3,000 tons.....	72	134,615	8	11,600	17	30,250	—	—	23	32,915	—	—
Cruisers, below 1,000 tons, gunboats.....	55	42,870	—	—	15	8,635	—	—	3	2,530	—	—
Destroyers.....	108	34,320	42	12,600	55	9,085	—	—	4	1,095	16	6,695
Torpedo boats.....	167	7,295	2	350	228	14,245	14	1,220	23	2,400	12	2,005
Training vessels.....	9	6,085	—	—	9	36,175	—	—	8	25,105	—	—
Total displacement.....	569	1,448,360	77	347,050	400	588,580	28	125,610	98	302,650	53	217,420
Total built and building.....tons..	646—1,795,410				428—714,190				151—520,070			

Type.	Germany.				Japan.				Russia.			
	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.	Built.	Tons.	Build-ing.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class (above 9,000 tons).....	9	95,782	5	60,000	4	54,400	2	30,400	15	162,915	7	92,300
Battle ships, second class, and coast-defense iron-clads (below 9,000 tons).....	26	88,920	—	—	5	17,505	—	—	19	74,490	—	—
Armored cruisers.....	4	35,780	2	17,740	6	51,285	1	9,850	11	82,730	1	7,800
Cruisers, protected and unprotected, not armored (above 3,000 tons).....	9	49,210	—	—	10	41,485	—	—	8	46,680	8	44,860
Cruisers, 1,000 to 3,000 tons.....	20	38,660	3	8,400	16	27,995	—	—	19	28,875	—	—
Cruisers, below 1,000 tons, gunboats.....	9	8,185	—	—	13	7,540	—	—	11	6,295	—	—
Destroyers.....	16	5,275	8	2,800	11	3,180	—	—	25	7,215	12	3,280
Torpedo boats.....	132	11,498	—	—	55	3,730	11	940	186	11,240	10	900
Training vessels.....	10	25,610	—	—	4	2,560	—	—	—	—	—	—
Total displacement.....	235	358,900	18	88,940	124	200,680	14	41,190	294	420,440	38	149,140
Total built and building.....tons..	253—447,840				138—250,870				332—569,580			

Rank of principal naval powers: Great Britain first, France second, Russia third, Germany fourth, United States fifth, Japan sixth.

OFFICE OF NAVAL INTELLIGENCE, January 1, 1906.

Sea strength of the principal naval powers—Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, of 1,000 or more tons, and of torpedo craft of more than 50 tons.

Type of vessel.	Great Britain.				France.				Germany.				United States.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	55	754,450	6	99,050	19	216,425	6	89,190	18	204,581	6	78,000	14	167,225	11	166,304
Coast-defense vessels ^b	5	43,700			17	73,273			13	69,602			12	47,445		
Armored cruisers.....	30	313,900	13	185,100	19	158,803	5	66,390	6	55,740	2	21,690	6	72,335	6	85,300
Cruisers above 6,000 tons ^c	21	201,000			4	31,754							3	24,450	2	19,400
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons ^c	52	224,840			18	74,476			14	63,840	6	19,650	17	61,379	3	11,250
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons ^c	37	70,230			17	30,469			23	46,040			24	33,153		
Torpedo-boat destroyers.....	144	54,068	18	7,510	31	9,250	23	8,650	53	20,281	6	2,478	16	6,095		
Torpedo boats.....	91	8,150			230	21,192	75	7,120	74	9,000			30	4,820	2	468
Submarines.....	19	3,000	10	3,000	37	4,033	32	3,963			1	190	8	913	4	600
Total tons built and total tons building.....	1,673,338		294,600		619,675		181,283		466,084		121,978		418,415		283,282	
Total tons built and building ..	1,967,938				800,953				588,062				701,797			

^a Battle ships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.

^b Includes smaller battle ships and monitors.

^c All unarmored war ships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

Sea strength of the principal naval powers—Number and displacement of war ships, built and building, etc.—Continued.

Type of vessel.	Japan.				Italy.				Russia.				Austria.			
	Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.		Built.		Building.	
	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.	No.	Tons.
Battle ships, first class ^a	9	120,240	3	52,200	13	165,969	4	50,500	8	92,429	4	57,233	1	10,600	2	21,900
Coast-defense vessels ^b	5	29,657	—	—	1	3,913	—	—	7	43,199	—	—	10	67,090	—	—
Armored cruisers	9	81,372	3	42,000	6	39,783	1	10,000	3	31,270	3	27,000	3	18,820	—	—
Cruisers above 6,000 tons	2	13,130	—	—	—	—	—	—	5	33,110	3	20,025	—	—	—	—
Cruisers, 6,000 to 3,000 tons	10	40,275	1	3,420	5	17,663	1	5,500	4	15,765	—	—	2	8,128	—	—
Cruisers, 3,000 to 1,000 tons	10	19,774	—	—	12	27,107	—	—	7	8,760	2	3,916	7	14,250	—	—
Torpedo-boat destroyers	24	8,166	24	9,120	13	4,150	4	1,520	33	10,583	51	21,540	1	300	—	—
Torpedo boats	81	7,317	—	—	97	8,036	27	5,580	82	8,000	—	—	38	3,478	—	—
Submarines	9	1,200	—	—	1	107	5	600	13	1,485	12	1,380	—	—	—	—
Total tons built and total tons building	—	321,131	—	106,740	—	266,728	—	73,700	—	244,601	—	131,094	—	122,756	—	21,200
Total tons built and building	427,871				340,428				375,695				143,956			

^a Battle ships, first class, are those of (about) 10,000 or more tons displacement.

^b Includes smaller battle ships and monitors.

^c All unarmored war ships of more than 1,000 tons are, in this table, classed according to displacement as cruisers. Scouts are considered as cruisers in which battery and protection have been sacrificed to secure extreme speed. The word "protected" has been omitted because all cruisers except the smallest and oldest now have protective decks.

N. B.—The following vessels are not included in the tables: Those over twenty years old, unless they have been reconstructed and rearmed; those not actually begun, although authorized; transports, colliers, repair ships, torpedo-depot ships, converted merchant vessels or yachts; vessels of less than 1,000 tons, except torpedo craft; torpedo craft of less than 50 tons.

Relative order of war-ship tonnage.

At present.		As would be the case were vessels building now completed.	
Nation.	Tonnage.	Nation.	Tonnage.
Great Britain	1,673,338	Great Britain	1,967,693
France	619,675	France	800,953
Germany	466,034	United States	701,797
United States	418,415	Germany	588,082
Japan	321,131	Japan	427,871
Italy	266,728	Russia	375,695
Russia	244,601	Italy	340,428
Austria	122,756	Austria	143,956

^a This does not include the Michigan and South Carolina, battle ships of about 16,000 tons, authorized, but not building.

It will be observed that while in 1880 the United States was the sixth world power, to-day we are third, Great Britain being first and France second.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the indulgence of the House for a few moments to discuss the wisdom of building war ships

in the navy-yards of the country, and will incorporate in my remarks a table giving the names and character of the ships authorized by Congress and constructed since 1895, with the places where they were built, the cost, and the time consumed in their construction in excess of the time allowed in the contracts.

Vessels built since January 1, 1896, with cost and excess of contract time.

Name of vessel.	Type.	Built by—	Date of contract.	Contract date of completion.	Preliminary acceptance.	Excess over contract time.		Cost of vessel to December 31, 1905.
						Months.	Days.	
Kearsarge	Battle ship.	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Jan. 2, 1896	Jan. 2, 1899	Nov. 8, 1899	10	5	\$4,429,890.69
Kentucky	do	do	do	do	Dec. 30, 1899	11	27	4,418,094.99
Illinois	do	Newport News Co., Newport News, Va.	Sept. 26, 1896	Sept. 26, 1899	Sept. 16, 1901	23	20	4,073,429.26
Alabama	do	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.	Sept. 24, 1896	Sept. 24, 1899	Oct. 22, 1900	12	27	4,077,010.09
Wisconsin	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Sept. 19, 1896	Sept. 19, 1899	Jan. 17, 1901	15	28	4,162,617.53
Dahlgren	Torpedo boat.	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	Oct. 6, 1896	Apr. 6, 1898	Nov. 24, 1899	19	17	200,771.07
T. A. M. Craven	do	do	do	do	Mar. 20, 1900	23	13	200,722.84
Farragut	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Oct. 5, 1896	Apr. 5, 1898	Jan. 30, 1899	9	24	246,902.23
Davis	do	Wolff & Zwicker Iron Works, Portland, Oreg.	Oct. 6, 1896	Oct. 6, 1897	Jan. 26, 1899	15	19	97,661.97
Fox	do	do	do	do	Mar. 13, 1899	17	6	100,285.93
Morris	do	Herreshoff Mfg. Co., Bristol, R. I.	do	do	May 12, 1898	7	5	94,923.87
Talbot	do	Herreshoff Mfg. Co., Bristol, R. I.	Oct. 6, 1896	Oct. 6, 1897	Mar. 26, 1898	5	19	41,863.00
Gwin	do	do	do	do	do	5	19	41,688.24
Mackenzie	do	Chas. Hillman S. & E. B. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 7, 1896	Oct. 7, 1897	Jan. 7, 1899	15	—	66,334.59
McKee	do	Columbian Iron Works, Baltimore, Md.	do	do	May 24, 1898	7	16	59,003.71
Stringham	do	Harlan & Hollingsworth Co., Wilmington, Del.	July 29, 1897	Jan. 29, 1899	(a)	—	—	274,280.35
Goldsborough	do	Wolff & Zwicker Iron Works, Portland, Oreg.	July 30, 1897	Jan. 30, 1899	(b)	—	—	262,170.91
Bailey	do	Gas Engine & Power Co., Morris Heights, N. Y.	July 28, 1897	Jan. 28, 1899	May 29, 1901	28	—	234,290.09
Chesapeake	Training ship.	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	Mar. 16, 1898	June 16, 1899	July 22, 1899	1	5	357,641.96
Maine	Battle ship.	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia.	Oct. 1, 1898	June 1, 1901	Dec. 29, 1902	18	27	4,566,642.69
Missouri	do	Newport News Co., Newport News, Va.	Dec. 30, 1898	Aug. 30, 1901	Dec. 1, 1903	27	—	4,438,925.03
Ohio	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Oct. 5, 1898	June 5, 1901	Sept. 10, 1904	39	4	4,475,180.32
Bainbridge	Torpedo-boat destroyer.	Neafie & Levy S. & E. B. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Oct. 1, 1898	Apr. 1, 1900	Nov. 4, 1902	31	2	303,900.63
Barry	do	do	do	do	Oct. 30, 1902	30	28	303,380.15
Chauncey	do	do	do	do	Oct. 22, 1902	30	20	303,287.43
Dale	do	Wm. R. Trigg Co., Richmond, Va.	Nov. 16, 1898	May 16, 1900	July 17, 1902	26	—	278,990.35
Decatur	do	do	do	do	Apr. 1, 1902	22	15	276,038.01
Hopkins	do	Harlan & Hollingsworth Co., Wilmington, Del.	Oct. 19, 1898	Apr. 19, 1900	May 27, 1903	37	7	313,330.79
Hull	do	do	do	do	Mar. 18, 1903	34	26	318,316.05

^a Forfeited to Government Nov. 27, 1903.

^b Forfeited to Government Jan. 21, 1902.

Vessels built since January 1, 1896, with cost and excess of contract time—Continued.

Name of vessel.	Type.	Built by—	Date of contract.	Contract date of completion.	Preliminary acceptance.	Excess over contract time.		Cost of vessel to December 31, 1905.
						Months.	Days.	
Lawrence.....	Torpedo-boat destroyer.	Fore River S. B. Co., Quincy, Mass.	Dec. 3, 1898	Apr. 3, 1900	Apr. 7, 1903	36	3	\$296,659.77
MacDonough.....	do	do	do	May 3, 1900	July 3, 1903	38		297,023.98
Paul Jones.....	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Oct. 5, 1898	Apr. 5, 1900	July 19, 1902	27	13	301,279.01
Perry.....	do	do	do	do	May 31, 1902	25	25	303,390.47
Preble.....	do	do	do	do	June 21, 1902	26	15	302,882.71
Stewart.....	do	Gas Engine and Power Co., Morris Heights, N. Y.	Sept. 30, 1898	Feb. 28, 1900	Nov. 14, 1902	32	16	299,877.30
Truxtun.....	do	Maryland Steel Co., Sparrows Point, Md.	Oct. 4, 1898	Apr. 4, 1900	Aug. 16, 1902	28	11	304,537.10
Whipple.....	do	do	do	do	Oct. 9, 1902	30	4	303,754.39
Worden.....	do	do	do	do	Oct. 17, 1902	30	12	303,301.00
Bagley.....	Torpedo boat.	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	Oct. 19, 1898	Oct. 19, 1899	June 12, 1901	19	23	166,065.40
Barney.....	do	do	do	do	May 31, 1901	19	11	165,752.26
Biddle.....	do	do	do	do	Aug. 5, 1901	21	16	165,804.01
Blakely.....	do	Geo. Lawley & Sons, South Boston, Mass.	Sept. 27, 1898	Sept. 27, 1899	Sept. 14, 1904	59	17	182,105.02
De Long.....	do	do	do	do	Aug. 11, 1902	34	14	174,810.88
Nicholson.....	do	Lewis Nixon, Elizabeth, N. J.	Sept. 26, 1898	Sept. 26, 1899	(a)			202,183.49
O'Brien.....	do	do	do	do	(a)			215,688.26
Shubrick.....	do	Wm. R. Trigg Co., Richmond, Va.	Nov. 16, 1898	Nov. 16, 1899	May 31, 1901	18	14	145,299.20
Stockton.....	do	do	do	do	Jan. 18, 1901	14	1	137,729.64
Thornton.....	do	do	do	do	Apr. 1, 1902	28	15	144,425.90
Tingey.....	do	Columbian Iron Works, Baltimore, Md.	Oct. 1, 1898	Oct. 1, 1899	Dec. 15, 1903	50	13	196,707.65
Wilkes.....	do	Gas Engine and Power Co., Morris Heights, N. Y.	Sept. 30, 1898	Sept. 30, 1899	July 27, 1902	33	26	162,057.07
Plunger.....	Submarine torpedo boat	Holland Torpedo Boat Co., New York, N. Y.	Nov. 19, 1900	Oct. 19, 1901	June 24, 1903	20	4	196,034.45
Adder.....	do	do	Aug. 25, 1900	Apr. 25, 1901	Jan. 9, 1903	20	14	173,657.80
Grampus.....	do	do	do	do	May 11, 1903	24	15	173,364.35
Moccasin.....	do	do	do	May 25, 1901	Jan. 13, 1903	19	18	173,671.04
Pike.....	do	do	do	do	May 11, 1903	23	15	173,288.41
Porpoise.....	do	do	do	June 25, 1901	June 24, 1903	23	29	171,843.44
Shark.....	do	do	do	July 25, 1901	do	22	29	171,431.34
Denver.....	Cruiser	Neale & Levy S. and E. B. Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Dec. 14, 1899	June 14, 1902	May 5, 1904	22	20	1,135,853.66
Des Moines.....	do	Fore River S. B. Co., Quincy, Mass.	do	do	Mar. 5, 1904	20	19	1,156,256.68
Chattanooga.....	do	Lewis Nixon, Elizabeth, N. J.	Dec. 14, 1899	June 14, 1902	(a)			1,377,717.78
Galveston.....	do	Wm. R. Trigg Co., Richmond, Va.	do	do	(b)			1,426,111.45
Tacoma.....	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	do	do	Jan. 18, 1904	19	3	1,113,395.45
Cleveland.....	do	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	do	do	Oct. 29, 1903	16	14	1,098,320.33
Pennsylvania.....	Armored cruiser	Wm. Cramp & Sons, Philadelphia, Pa.	Jan. 10, 1901	Jan. 10, 1904	Mar. 9, 1905	13	26	4,819,696.37
Colorado.....	do	do	do	do	Jan. 10, 1905	12		4,792,510.44
West Virginia.....	do	Newport News Co., Newport, News, Va.	Jan. 24, 1901	Jan. 24, 1904	Feb. 23, 1905	12	29	4,725,920.90
Maryland.....	do	do	do	do	Apr. 18, 1905	14	24	4,744,771.71
Charleston.....	Cruiser	do	Mar. 30, 1901	Mar. 30, 1904	Aug. 31, 1905	17		3,081,073.76
Rhode Island.....	Battle ship	Fore River S. B. Co., Quincy, Mass.	Feb. 15, 1901	Feb. 15, 1904	Feb. 12, 1906	24	2	5,060,935.00
Dubuque.....	Gunboat	Gas Engine and Power Co., Morris Heights, N. Y.	May 29, 1903	Nov. 29, 1904	May 31, 1905	6	1	322,999.67
Paducah.....	do	do	July 6, 1903	Mar. 6, 1905	Aug. 31, 1905	5	24	361,094.08
Boxer.....	Training brig	Navy Yard, Portsmouth, N. H.	(c)	(c)	(c)			94,703.14
Arkansas.....	Monitor	Newport News Co., Newport News, Va.	Oct. 11, 1898	Mar. 11, 1901	Sept. 8, 1902	17	27	\$1,413,962.99
Nevada.....	do	Bath Iron Works, Bath, Me.	Oct. 19, 1898	Mar. 19, 1901	Mar. 5, 1903	23	13	1,366,488.61
Florida.....	do	Lewis Nixon, Elizabeth, N. J.	do	do	do			1,306,932.73
Wyoming.....	do	Union Iron Works, San Francisco, Cal.	Oct. 5, 1898	Mar. 5, 1901	Dec. 1, 1902	20	25	1,372,093.16

a Forfeited to Government Aug. 14, 1903.

b Forfeited to Government May 14, 1903.

c Was begun at the navy-yard May 12, 1903. Construction period fixed as ending July, 1904, and reported completed May, 1905. Cost of vessel to December 31, 1905, furnished by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

It will be observed that of the seventy-seven vessels included in this list only one—the training ship *Boxer*—was constructed at a Government yard, and every single one of them exceeded the

contract time allowance, some as much as four years and very few less than two years. I also submit a list of the ships authorized by Congress and now being constructed in private yards:

Vessels building under contract.

Name.	By whom building.	Estimate of—		Contract time.	Expiration of contract time.
		Degree of completion July 1, 1905.	Probable date of completion.		
BATTLE SHIPS.					
Virginia	Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company	Per cent.		Months.	
Nebraska	Moran Brothers Company	89.7	Feb. 1, 1906	36	Feb. 15, 1904
Georgia	Bath Iron Works	75.0	Sept. 6, 1906	36	Mar. 7, 1904
New Jersey	Fore River Shipbuilding Company	82.6	May 6, 1906	36	Feb. 18, 1904
Rhode Island	do	86.2	Mar. 18, 1906	36	Feb. 15, 1904
Louisiana	do	88.8	Feb. 3, 1906	36	Do.
Vermont	Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company	80.7	June 15, 1906	41	Mar. 15, 1906
Kansas	Fore River Shipbuilding Company	53.6	May 12, 1907	42	Dec. 20, 1906
Minnesota	New York Shipbuilding Company	55.1	Jan. 27, 1907	42	Dec. 16, 1906
Mississippi	Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company	68.0	Dec. 20, 1906	42	Dec. 20, 1906
Idaho	Wm. Cramp & Sons	31.2	Mar. 25, 1907	38	Mar. 25, 1907
New Hampshire	do	29.5	May 25, 1907	40	May 25, 1907
	New York Shipbuilding Company	11.2	Feb. 27, 1908	38	Feb. 27, 1908
ARMORED CRUISERS.					
California	Union Iron Works	78.3	Aug. 1, 1906	36	Jan. 10, 1904
South Dakota	do	76.1	Sept. 1, 1906	36	Do.
Tennessee	Wm. Cramp & Sons	79.4	Aug. 9, 1906	42	Aug. 9, 1906
Washington	New York Shipbuilding Company	79.1	Aug. 10, 1906	42	Aug. 10, 1906
North Carolina	Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company	9.1	Jan. 3, 1908	36	Jan. 8, 1908
Montana	do	7.9	Jan. 15, 1908	36	Do.

Vessels building under contract—Continued.

Name.	By whom building	Estimate of—		Contract.	Expiration of contract time.
		Degree of completion July 1, 1905.	Probable date of completion.		
PROTECTED CRUISERS.		<i>Per cent.</i>		<i>Months.</i>	
St. Louis.....	Neafie & Levy Shipbuilding Company	67.4	July 30, 1906	35	Mar. 11, 1904
Milwaukee.....	Union Iron Works.....	75.2	Oct. 17, 1906	36	Apr. 17, 1904
Charleston.....	Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company	97.0	Aug. 31, 1906	36	Mar. 30, 1904
SCOUT CRUISERS.					
Chester.....	Bath Iron Works.....		May 4, 1908	36	May 4, 1908
Birmingham.....	Fore River Shipbuilding Company		Nov. 17, 1907	30	Nov. 17, 1907
Salem.....	do.....		Mar. 17, 1908	34	Mar. 17, 1908
TORPEDO BOATS (SUBMARINE).					
No. 9.....	Electric Boat Company		Sept. 6, 1906	12	Sept. 6, 1906
No. 10.....	do.....		do	12	Do.
No. 11.....	do.....		Sept. 18, 1906	12	Sept. 18, 1906
No. 12.....	do.....		do	12	Do.

With the exception of the *Louisiana*, I am advised that the time consumed in the building of these ships will exceed the time limit of the contracts.

I also submit a list of the ships now being constructed, or authorized to be constructed in the navy-yards of the country:

Vessels building at navy-yards.

Name.	Where building.	Estimate of—		Construc- tional period.	Expiration of construc- tional period.
		Degree of completion July 1, 1905.	Probable date of com- pletion.		
BATTLE SHIP.					
Connecticut	Navy-yard, New York	Per cent. 80.7	June 15, 1903	Months. 41	Mar. 15, 1906
TRAINING SHIPS.					
Cumberland ^a	Navy-yard, Boston	95.0		20	May 1, 1905
Intrepid ^a	Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal	97.5		20	Do.
COLLIERS.					
Vestal ^b	Navy-yard, New York				
Prometheus ^c	Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal				

^a Work suspended pending Congressional action as to additional appropriations to complete.

^b Formerly Erie.

^c Formerly Ontario.

It will be observed that of the ships now being constructed and excluding the colliers only three out of thirty-one are being built in the navy-yards, and a total of 4 out of the 108 ships authorized in the past ten years, so that it surely can not be said that these great Government plants, constructed and maintained at a large cost to the Government, are getting more than they are entitled to.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the only means of comparison we have in this matter is in the battle ships *Connecticut* and *Louisiana*. These vessels were authorized at the first session of the Fifty-seventh Congress. The *Louisiana* is being constructed by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company and the *Connecticut* in the navy-yard at Brooklyn, N. Y. The limit of cost for each, exclusive of armament and armor, was fixed at \$4,212,000. Both are now practically completed, and for the first time in battle-ship construction will be finished within the time limit. This is the result of the pace set by the navy-yard and the determination of the Newport News people not to be beaten. The facts are that vessels contracted for with the Newport News Company one year before the *Louisiana* are not as far advanced.

It has been argued that we should not have another battle ship built at a navy-yard, for the reason that it costs more to construct. What are the facts?

The cost of the *Connecticut* and *Louisiana* up to December 31, 1905, including armor, was: *Connecticut*, \$5,374,000.54; *Louisiana*, \$5,185,655.01, a difference of less than 2 per cent.

I observe that the bill under consideration carries with it a provision to increase the limit of the cost of the *Connecticut* \$400,000, while I am not prepared to admit it will cost that much more than the *Louisiana*. For argument's sake, granting it to be so, it would only mean a matter of 9½ per cent; this is infinitely less than the figures submitted when the bill authorizing the construction of these vessels was under consideration in the Fifty-seventh Congress, at which time the statement was made by the chairman of the Naval Committee, on the authority of the then Naval Constructor Admiral Bowles, that it would cost from 25 to 50 per cent more to build at the navy-yards.

Permit me to quote the figures relating to certain alterations in these two vessels, the result of an inquiry by my colleague [Mr. FITZGERALD], and contained in House Document No. 539, which show that the alteration in the plans of the *Connecticut* cost \$112,009, while in the *Louisiana* they cost \$132,986.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as a matter of good governmental policy, is it not best that we should make it a fixed rule to have this construction of vessels continue without interruption in the navy-yards of the country, even if it does cost slightly more to build them there than in private yards?

I am going to cite the yard at Brooklyn, N. Y.

How many Members of this House have visited; or, I might ask, how many members of the Committee on Naval Affairs have visited it? It is the largest and best equipped of any of the Government yards, and will compare with the private yards of the country. It covers 118.77 acres of land, and 59.05 acres are under water; it has three dry docks, and is constructing a fourth; it can float, and is equipped to construct, any vessel Congress will authorize; the land occupied by the yard is valued by the Government at \$12,354,000, although actually worth \$20,000,000, and the buildings, docks, machinery, etc., exclusive of tools, is valued at \$11,578,489. Located in the heart of the great city of New York, with its magnificent harbor and unequaled railroad facilities, it is easily the best fitted for the largest shipbuilding plant in the world.

We were compelled, in the construction of the *Connecticut*, to create an organization for the purpose of building this ship. It was our first effort; much time and money was lost in preliminaries. Our organization is still intact. It will not now be an experimental matter, and I will venture the statement that in our next undertaking, even considering the fact that at the navy-yard our men work eight hours a day against ten hours in the private yards, we will be able to keep the difference in cost down to a very small figure, if not equal that of the private yards.

This is a great country; we have a great Navy, and will have a still larger one. Is it not best that, on the Atlantic

seaboard, we should have at least one Government plant equipped for any emergency at a moment's notice, with men of the greatest skill, to handle any naval proposition the Government might be called upon to face? [Loud applause.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri raises the point of order that there is no quorum present.

Mr. BURTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. It is doubtful if the committee will have authority to grant permission until first ascertaining whether a quorum is present or not.

Mr. FOSS. I will say to the gentleman from Missouri I am going to move that the committee rise.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the committee says that he is going to move that the committee rise, and therefore I withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRUMPACKER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 18750—the naval appropriation bill—and had instructed him to report that it had come to no resolution thereon.

SCHOOL SALARIES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. WANGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to print a brief statement in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 18442, which is on the Calendar of unfinished business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to print a statement in the RECORD in connection with the bill H. R. 18442. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this in relation to the bill to reorganize the schools?

Mr. WANGER. Yes, sir. It is in relation to the bill to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the board of education of the District of Columbia.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman want to debate it now?

Mr. WANGER. No. I asked to print in the RECORD a brief statement relative to librarians in the United States, so that it may be considered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

PUBLIC EDUCATION ASSOCIATION, Washington, D. C., May 1, 1906.

To the Representatives in the Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: On pages 5867 to 5868 in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for April 23 it appears that the questions of librarians in the public schools is laid over for the consideration of the individual Members of Congress.

The Public Education Association would therefore respectfully submit to you the following facts and suggestions showing the value which is placed upon school librarians in nearly every State in the Union. (See tabulated statement attached—Table I.)

A library is an absolutely necessary educational tool in every high school or central county school. Children who are not trained in the use of reference books and not taught to search for literary sources, general and special, will soon after they leave school sink back into ignorance. The people and the teachers, as well as the educational authorities, have recognized this importance by establishing numerous school libraries and appointing librarians for their successful use. There are now in the United States as many as 6,656 school libraries. There are, in fact, more school libraries than public institutions of that kind in this country. (See Table III.) In most of these school libraries professional librarians are employed. Where that is not the case, one of the teachers of the school performs these duties.

For further, more minute information we take the liberty of referring you to the annual report for 1903 of the United States Commissioner of Education. That record is replete with most interesting information on public school libraries in the United States. (See pp. 759-1017.)

Table II is a list of public school libraries of the District of Columbia in the order of the date of their foundation. It will be seen that they are not of recent growth, but have proved their value and should be fostered by the just and beneficent wisdom of Congress.

We respectfully urge that the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and of the board of education (H. R. 8472, p. 2, lines 21 to 22; and H. R. 18442, p. 6, lines 7 and 8) for specific salary provision for teachers and high school librarians be granted.

Respectfully,

GERTRUDE B. DARWIN,
Secretary of the Association.

TABLE I.—Public school librarians in the United States.

State or Territory.	Normal.	High.	Elementary.
Alabama	3		
Arizona	1		
Arkansas		2	
California	6	10	45
Colorado	1	5	5
Connecticut	2	7	1
Delaware			1
District of Columbia	1	5	
Florida			
Georgia	2	1	1
Illinois	5	21	13
Indiana	3	10	7
Indian Territory			
Iowa	2	5	16
Kansas	2	12	6
Kentucky	1	2	
Louisiana	2	4	2
Maine	2	1	1
Maryland	1	1	1
Massachusetts	3	14	6
Michigan	5	17	31
Minnesota	4	14	19
Mississippi	1	3	1
Missouri	4	5	15
Montana	1	2	
Nebraska	3	4	3
Nevada		1	
New Hampshire			
New Jersey	2	6	13
New Mexico	1		
New York	9	18	54
North Carolina	2	3	
North Dakota	2	1	3
Ohio		7	26
Oklahoma	2		
Oregon	1		
Pennsylvania	12	11	19
Rhode Island	1		1
South Dakota	2		3
Tennessee			1
Texas	1	4	2
Utah			1
Vermont		1	1
Virginia	2		1
Washington	2	2	1
West Virginia	2	1	
Wisconsin	7	18	14
Wyoming		1	1

NOTE.—In the above table are not included public school librarians having charge of less than 1,000 books.

The above table has been compiled with painstaking accuracy by the Public Education Association of Washington, D. C., from the official statistics of 1903 of the United States Bureau of Education. In the last three years the growth in the number of public school librarians has been marked, as this necessary branch of public school equipment was recognized and developed, but the latest statistics are not available at this date.

TABLE II.—Public school libraries in the District of Columbia, 1903.

Name.	Founded.	Volumes.
Curtis School (Peabody Library)	1873	9,000
Central High School	1880	6,200
Business High School	1830	1,000
M Street High School	1890	2,370
Western High School	1891	1,100
Eastern High School	1892	2,480
Teachers' library (normal school)	1895	10,000

TABLE III.—Public school libraries in the United States.

State or Territory.	Schools.	Volumes.
United States	6,656	4,107,086
North Atlantic division	1,493	1,268,179
South Atlantic division	401	180,273
South Central division	573	228,632
North Central division	3,778	2,171,172
Western division	411	258,830
North Atlantic division:		
Maine	122	29,822
New Hampshire	47	14,407
Vermont	61	20,631
Massachusetts	224	139,353
Rhode Island	19	14,226
Connecticut	75	65,907
New York	403	635,390
New Jersey	99	83,479
Pennsylvania	440	265,554
South Atlantic division:		
Delaware	11	2,588
Maryland	53	24,443
District of Columbia	6	7,951
Virginia	39	12,088
West Virginia	38	26,404
North Carolina	35	20,034

TABLE III.—Public school libraries in the United States—Continued.

State or Territory.	Schools.	Volumes.
South Atlantic division—Continued.		
South Carolina.....	69	24,873
Georgia.....	110	43,705
Florida.....	40	12,177
South Central division:		
Kentucky.....	70	33,393
Tennessee.....	58	17,031
Alabama.....	46	19,293
Mississippi.....	68	26,272
Louisiana.....	32	22,759
Texas.....	236	86,437
Arkansas.....	41	15,616
Oklahoma.....	19	6,981
Indian Territory.....	3	850
North Central division:		
Ohio.....	733	265,188
Indiana.....	530	273,824
Illinois.....	392	220,867
Michigan.....	359	290,592
Wisconsin.....	224	200,892
Minnesota.....	153	174,294
Iowa.....	342	202,765
Missouri.....	302	153,761
North Dakota.....	37	22,752
South Dakota.....	87	39,022
Nebraska.....	338	87,006
Kansas.....	281	131,209
Western division:		
Montana.....	25	15,716
Wyoming.....	10	4,903
Colorado.....	55	61,896
New Mexico.....	9	8,715
Arizona.....	4	2,350
Utah.....	10	5,505
Nevada.....	9	3,610
Idaho.....	13	7,933
Washington.....	78	36,709
Oregon.....	62	22,058
California.....	136	89,435

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for reproducing plats of surveys destroyed at San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy submitting an estimate of appropriation for arms, equipage, etc., of the Marine Corps, to replace similar articles destroyed at San Francisco—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Acting Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for State and Territorial homes for disabled soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for jails in Alaska—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for rent of temporary offices for the General Land Office—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of the harbor and approaches to St. Louis, Mo.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MANN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5890) to authorize the South and Western Railroad Company

to construct bridges across the Clinch River and the Holston River, in the States of Virginia and Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3793); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5891) to authorize the South and Western Railway Company to construct bridges across the Clinch River and the Holston River, in the States of Virginia and Tennessee, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3794); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLE, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18328), to regulate the practice in certain civil and criminal cases in the western district of Arkansas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3795); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 18532) to authorize the Kansas City, St. Joseph and Excelsior Springs Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Missouri River, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3796); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House H. R. 18436, reported in lieu thereof a bill (H. R. 18964) to define and limit the immunity provisions of the Statutes of the United States, accompanied by a report (No. 3797); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5572) to amend section 4348 of the Revised Statutes, establishing great coasting districts of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3798); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 394) granting an increase of pension to Amanda Lucas, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3720); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 442) granting an increase of pension to Francis Colton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3721); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOPKINS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 522) granting an increase of pension to Emma Worrall, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3722); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 557) granting an increase of pension to Mariot Losure, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3723); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 678) granting an increase of pension to Albert Butler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3724); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 869) granting an increase of pension to Baltzar Mowan, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3725); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 993) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. Langdon, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3726); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1508) granting an increase of pension to James A. Murch, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3727); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1513) granting an increase of pension to Harriett A. Rawles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3728); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1705) granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. George, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3729); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. FULLER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Wolf, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3730); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2467) granting an increase of pension to Martin Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3731); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2851) granting an increase of pension to George Chambers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3732); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2978) granting an increase of pension to Eli W. Knowles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3733); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3033) granting an increase of pension to Aaron F. Patten, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3734); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHAPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3040) granting a pension to Mary C. Wilsey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3735); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. EDWARDS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3219) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Allison, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3736); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3271) granting an increase of pension to Margarette E. Brown, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3737); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3299) granting an increase of pension to Spencer C. Stilwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3738); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3483) granting an increase of pension to William L. Sheaff, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3739); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3485) granting an increase of pension to Mathias Hammes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3740); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3797) granting an increase of pension to Ahimaaz E. Wood, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3741); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3798) granting an increase of pension to Charles Farrel, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3742); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4005) granting an increase of pension to Michael Quill, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3743); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4048) granting an increase of pension to Henry S. Knecht, reported

the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3744); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4175) granting an increase of pension to John Caverly, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3745); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4177) granting an increase of pension to Harlan P. Cobb, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3746); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4239) granting an increase of pension to Job Rice, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3747); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4358) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McCormick, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3748); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4361) granting an increase of pension to John W. Daley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3749); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BRADLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4401) granting an increase of pension to George W. Tomlinson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3750); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4457) granting an increase of pension to Louis A. Tyson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3751); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4460) granting an increase of pension to Ann J. Thompson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3752); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4525) granting an increase of pension to David Oglevie, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3753); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5247) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Wigal, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3754); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5163) granting an increase of pension to John Marah, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3755); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5082) granting an increase of pension to David N. Winsell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3756); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5054) granting an increase of pension to George H. Woodard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3757); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4796) granting an increase of pension to Lorinda J. White, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3758); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4752) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Tidswell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3759); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4718) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gilson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3760); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4692) granting an increase of pension to Adaline M. Thornton, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3761); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4665) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Du Bois, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3762); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4569) granting an increase of pension to Augustus A. Nevins, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3763); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5343) granting an increase of pension to Ernest H. Wardwell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3764); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5259) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ward, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3765); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5379) granting an increase of pension to Otto A. Risum, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3766); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5492) granting an increase of pension to Joseph F. Tebbetts, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3767); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5504) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dickson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3768); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5516) granting an increase of pension to Alfred M. Hamlen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3769); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5522) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Sischo, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3770); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5523) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Pickett, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3771); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5532) granting an increase of pension to Simon A. Snyder, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3772); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5539) granting an increase of pension to Hermann Muehlberg, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3773); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CHANEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5562) granting an increase of pension to John Hull, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3774); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5571) granting an increase of pension to Betsey B. Whitmore, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3775); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. KELIHER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5579) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Sisson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3776); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to

which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5603) granting a pension to Kate S. Hutchings, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3777); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOLLIDAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5631) granting an increase of pension to Isaac M. Howard, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3778); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5640) granting an increase of pension to Clinton B. Wintersteen, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3779); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5641) granting an increase of pension to John W. Fletcher, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3780); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5658) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Pruit, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3781); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5668) granting an increase of pension to George P. Sealey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3782); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5671) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Delong, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3783); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5673) granting an increase of pension to Hilton Springsteed, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3784); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DEEMER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5680) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Bowser, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3785); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5702) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Bingham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3786); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5704) granting an increase of pension to Ruth P. Pierce, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3787); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5735) granting an increase of pension to Andrew D. Danley, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3788); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5736) granting an increase of pension to Mary Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3789); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DIXON of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5754) granting a pension to Hannah McCarty, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3790); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEISSE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5780) granting a pension to Lorenzo E. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3791); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4983) granting an increase of pension to John M. Farquhar, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 3792); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: A bill (H. R. 18960) to revise and amend the statutes relating to patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 18961) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18962) to authorize the Secretary of War to grant a permit to construct and operate an electric railway through the Chattanooga and Chickamauga National Military Park—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington: A bill (H. R. 18963) authorizing the construction of a dam across the Pend d'Oreille River, in the State of Washington, by the Pend d'Oreille Development Company, for the development of water power, electrical power, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD, from the Committee on the Judiciary: A bill (H. R. 18964) to define and limit the immunity provisions of the Statutes of the United States—to the House Calendar.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A resolution (H. Res. 418) authorizing the Clerk of the House to pay to certain House employees a specified sum of money—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A resolution (H. Res. 419) authorizing the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Agriculture to make an examination into the expenditures of that Department—to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. GREGG: A resolution (H. Res. 420) asking the Secretary of State for information in regard to the seizure of the fishing schooner *Lizzie B. Adams*, and the arrest and imprisonment of her crew—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McLAIN: A memorial from the legislature of the State of Mississippi memorializing the Congress of the United States to endeavor to create a broader market for cotton and cotton goods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER: A bill (H. R. 18965) to correct the naval record of George W. Bone—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BARTLETT: A bill (H. R. 18966) granting a pension to John W. Ward—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BEIDLER: A bill (H. R. 18967) granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Brumbaugh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 18968) granting a pension to Vance Perkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: A bill (H. R. 18969) granting an increase of pension to Herman Hagemiller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BONYNGE: A bill (H. R. 18970) granting a pension to William A. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18971) granting a pension to Alice Norton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18972) granting an increase of pension to Vinton G. Holliday—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOUTELL: A bill (H. R. 18973) granting a pension to William Steers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18974) granting an increase of pension to Minna Hildebrand—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COCKS: A bill (H. R. 18975) granting an increase of pension to William S. Myton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURRIER: A bill (H. R. 18976) granting an increase of pension to Nelson S. Preston—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CURTIS: A bill (H. R. 18977) granting an increase of pension to James Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18978) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Goodwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18979) granting an increase of pension to Ophelia C. Baldwin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18980) granting an increase of pension to John Durner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18981) granting an increase of pension to N. E. Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18982) granting an increase of pension to Timothy O'Neil—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIDSON: A bill (H. R. 18983) granting an increase of pension to Nathan B. Prentice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DAVIS of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 18984) for the relief of James H. Hooe—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18985) granting a pension to Samuel T. Jones, alias Thomas Jenkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DWIGHT: A bill (H. R. 18986) granting an increase of pension to Manning Austin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 18987) granting an increase of pension to Augustus K. Ryno—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORDNEY: A bill (H. R. 18988) granting an increase of pension to Giles E. Fellows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18989) granting an increase of pension to Henry B. Peacock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 18990) for the relief of the Fykes Grove Primitive Baptist Church, of Sulphur Fork, Robertson County, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GREENE: A bill (H. R. 18991) granting an increase of pension to Catherine Cochrane—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18992) granting an increase of pension to George H. Rock—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 18993) granting an increase of pension to James Shaw—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUDGER: A bill (H. R. 18994) for the relief of G. B. Poteet, administrator of the estate of Aguilla Swann, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HASKINS: A bill (H. R. 18995) granting a pension to Lucy Skinner—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 18996) for the relief of the estate of Robert R. Berry, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEVER: A bill (H. R. 18997) granting an increase of pension to Josephine Hardester—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEFIELD: A bill (H. R. 18998) granting an increase of pension to Robert Hanly, 2d—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: A bill (H. R. 18999) granting an increase of pension to Harry C. McCool—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McLAIN: A bill (H. R. 19000) for the relief of the estate of Emanuel M. Solari, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19001) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. McKay—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MACON: A bill (H. R. 19002) to correct the military record of Thomas P. Allmond—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAHON: A bill (H. R. 19003) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and to provide for the payment of French spoliation claims recommended by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the acts approved January 20, 1885, and March 3, 1891, and for other purposes—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 19004) granting a pension to Sarah J. Watson, or Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19005) granting a pension to Gideon M. Burris—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUJO: A bill (H. R. 19006) for the relief of Adolph Hartiens, tutor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: A bill (H. R. 19007) granting an increase of pension to John C. Sparks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19008) granting an increase of pension to Stacy Hoon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RHINOCK: A bill (H. R. 19009) granting an increase of pension to Lafayette H. McClung—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SLEMP: A bill (H. R. 19010) granting an increase of pension to Charles Edwards—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 19011) granting an increase of pension to E. K. Childs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19012) granting an increase of pension to A. P. Glaspie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19013) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SOUTHWICK: A bill (H. R. 19014) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Waller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELBORN: A bill (H. R. 19015) for the relief of the heirs of J. A. J. Rooker, deceased, and James Deatherage, administrator of estate of deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 19016) granting a pension to Mary Wehrmann—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of the Methodist Protestant Church of New Brighton, Pa., for Sunday closing of the Jamestown Exposition—to the Select Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: Petition of citizens, against conditions existing in the Kongo Free State—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BELL of Georgia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of John S. Dillard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Swinfield Stanley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BENNET of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of William Winslow Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Herman Hage Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of G. Albert Hinksay, Louis A. Green, and Grange No. 851, for the pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CURRIER: Petition of citizens of the State of New Hampshire, against bill S. 529 (the ship-subsidy bill)—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: Petition of citizens of New York, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: Petition of the Amalgamated Association of Street and Electric Railway Employees of America, for retention of the present Chinese-exclusion law—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the Negro Development and Exposition Company of the United States of America, for an appropriation relative to said company's exhibit at the Jamestown Exposition—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

Also, petition of S. R. Taber, against bill S. 5538, relative to superintendence of Indian affairs in Alaska—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of the Society for Political Study, of New York City, for bills S. 50 and H. R. 4462 (the child-labor bills)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GAINES of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the Fykes Grove Primitive Baptist Church—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petitions of Fames, Linwood, Social, Goshen, Harmony, Beach, American Star, Purity, Tuckahoe, and Washington Councils, Junior Order United American Mechanics, favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Washington Camps, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Atlantic City and Pemberton, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Rules.

Also, petition of Mary J. Hunt Council, Daughters of Liberty, of Millville, N. J., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of members of St. Luke Council, No. 438, Knights of Columbus, for a memorial of Christopher Columbus—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRANGER: Petition of Rhode Island Chapter of the American Institute of Architecture, for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. GUDGER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the estate of Aquilla Swan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JONES of Virginia: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Robert R. Berry—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Nebraska: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mary A. Peterson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAMB: Petition of St. Andrew's School, Richmond,

Va., for the Burton bill (H. R. 18024) for preservation of Niagara Falls—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEVER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Mina A. Boswell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIVINGSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harry C. McCool—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MOON of Tennessee: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Sarah J. Watson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Washington Pryor—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MUDD: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Frederick A. Holden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PAYNE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Koester—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PUJO: Petition of the Society for Political Study, of New York City, for bills S. 2962 and 50 and H. R. 4462 (child labor and children's bureau)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. REYNOLDS: Petition of the Civic Club of Cambria County, of Johnstown, Pa., against repeal of the Norris law relative to forest reservations—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHINOCK: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Lafayette H. McLeary—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of citizens of Genesee County, Mich., against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Local No. 303, American Federation of Musicians, C. A. Bush, jr., president, for bill H. R. 8748 for relief of civilian musicians—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of professors and students of Yale University, favoring consolidation of third and fourth class mail matter—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: Petition of citizens of Texas, against religious legislation in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULLIVAN of New York: Petition of the Society for Political Study, of New York City, for bills S. 50 and H. R. 4462 and S. 2762—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of Gen. Green B. Raum, L. A. Grant, C. D. Macdougall, and Samuel J. Crawford, for bill S. 2162, creating a volunteer retired list—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the Frankfort Business Men's Club, against amendments to the pure-food bill calculated to impair its efficiency—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 331, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Edge Hill, Pa., favoring restriction of immigration—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, May 5, 1906.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the reprint of Public Law No. 129, entitled "An act to provide for the final disposition of the affairs of the Five Civilized Tribes in the Indian Territory, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent for a reprint of the public law designated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the naval appropriation bill in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 6022. An act to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to define and fix the standard of value, to maintain the parity